38791

LS70.2
CC
1870

AUTHOR

Church Congress

TITLE

ort of the proceedings

E DUE

BORROWER'S NAME

CBGTU

NO. 4

0.2
0
91

Library of the
Church Divinity School
of the Pacific

AUTHORIZED REPORT

OF THE

CHURCH CONGRESS

HELD AT SOUTHAMPTON

OCTOBER 11, 12, 13, *&* 14,

1870.

Southampton:
GUTCH & COX, PRINTERS AND PUBLISHERS.
LONDON, OXFORD, & CAMBRIDGE: RIVINGTONS.

GRADUATE THEOLOGICAL UNION
CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL of the PACIFIC
LIBRARY
LIBRARY

L570.2
CC
1870

PREFACE.

A few words of *explanation* are due to the members for the tardy appearance of the report of proceedings of the Congress. Desirous of ensuring accuracy, the Editor distributed the reports of speeches among the several speakers for their correction, immediately on the receipt of them from the publishers, who undertook the charge of having them reported; and as soon as they were returned to him he forwarded them to the press. In passing through these several stages much valuable time was lost. It is not for the Editor to say more than that he has spared no pains nor trouble to expedite the publication, and although he has failed in his efforts, he begs the members to believe that the delay does not lie at his door. He takes this opportunity of thanking the numerous readers and speakers for the readiness with which they complied with his request that they would undertake the correction of the papers submitted to them; and he trusts that the volume will be found to contain a faithful and accurate record of all that was said and done at the several meetings.

No words need now to be written in defence of Church Congresses. They are an established institution, and are usually looked for by all parties in the Church with interest and anxiety. It may, however, be useful to give some account of the preparatory steps taken, which resulted in so successful a meeting as that of Southampton.

The selection of Southampton for the place of meeting was made at the close of the Liverpool Congress in 1869, but was not generally known until the Clergy and Laity of the town and neighbourhood were invited to hear from Earl Nelson, on the 10th of February, an exposition of the local and other measures to be adopted, if the Town should decide on receiving the Congress. The meeting was well attended; and all were of one mind, not only to welcome the Congress to the town, but to exert themselves strenuously in the promotion of the object. At this and subsequent meetings a very large general Committee was formed, before whom the proceedings of all the other Committees were to be brought for confirmation. After the month of February it was not found necessary to convene this Committee more than twice—in May and September. The great work of preparation was carried on by an Executive Committee consisting of twenty-five Clergy and as

38791

many Laity, with ten Vice-presidents. This Committee was fortunate in securing the services of an able and energetic Chairman in Mr. Wyndham Portal, who never flagged in his duties. It was early determined to establish a Guarantee Fund, which was the more necessary, inasmuch as it was foreseen that a large outlay would be required to provide a suitable building, there being no hall in the town which would hold more than about 1200; and the receipts of previous Congresses had been generally found only just to cover the necessary expenses, when the locality furnished an adequate building without the necessity for a special erection.

Out of the Executive Committee were formed two Sub-Committees: that for the "Selection of subjects for discussion" being composed of ten Laymen and ten Clergymen, with a Chairman (Earl Nelson); and the other, of "Reception" and "Finance," consisting of fifteen members, with a Chairman (the Mayor of Southampton), specially charged with the duties of raising a guarantee fund, providing a suitable building, issuing tickets, arranging for lodgings, hospitality, reception, and accommodation of visitors, etc., etc. These had constantly to report their proceedings to the Executive Committee, which was to meet once a month from the commencement to the period of Congress. Each Sub-Committee had its own Lay and Clerical Secretary, and the two Lay and Clerical Secretaries of the Congress were ex-officio members of all Committees.

The duties which devolved on the "Subjects" Committee were necessarily of a very responsible character, and on their due discharge would be mainly dependent the value of the forthcoming Congress. One spirit animated all its members—the desire, namely, to choose subjects of special interest at the time, and to endeavour to secure for the handling of them the best men of all views, without distinction of party. To this end it was unanimously resolved, at the first meeting of the Committee, that "The aim of this Congress being to secure a fair and full representation of all the principal schools of thought at present existing in our Church, in the selection of subjects those only should be recommended which are of high and general public interest at this time; and in the selection or acceptance of writers or speakers, care should be taken not to receive the names of such as might be reasonably expected at present to give offence; whilst it is at the same time distinctly understood that no man be objected to solely on the ground of his belonging to an extreme section of any party within the Church." To this resolution, early passed, it was doubtless owing that on no occasion was there the slightest approach to disunion in the Committee, though it included amongst its members men of widely differing opinions. And the spirit of peace here exhibited showed itself throughout the meetings of Congress, at which very divergent theological views were held forth without any asperity being evinced or aroused. Men agreed to differ—as they should. The issues now at stake between the Church and the world are too great for those who love the Lord to allow them to be imperilled by individual opinions strongly, however conscientiously, held, and put forth with anger and bitterness towards those who take another side of the same truth. About forty different subjects were suggested, out of which ten were selected, being mainly those which had been first proposed by the experience and judgment of the Chairman. A complaint was made at the Congress of the paucity of Lay readers of papers. This did not result from any lack of desire or endeavour to obtain a good Lay representation on the platform, but from numerous disappointments of those who were invited, and of some who accepted the invitation given them, but who, from various causes, were prevented fulfilling their engagements. Amongst the latter, were Sir Percival Heywood, Mr. F. S. Powell, Mr. Vaux, and Mr. Russell Gurney, whose absence was greatly regretted.

It being thought that no church in Southampton was sufficiently large to contain all who might be expected to attend the opening services, the Committee determined to invite two preachers, and to have services in two churches; and those eminent Prelates, the Bishops of Salisbury and Oxford, whose valuable sermons are inserted in this volume, most kindly acceded to the invitation. It will be a great disappointment to the members, as it is a source of deep regret to the Committee, that the Bishop of Peterborough could not be prevailed on to allow his sermon, preached in Winchester Cathedral on the day after the Congress, to be published; his Lordship not having time to revise the shorthand writer's report, or to rewrite the sermon, which was preached from notes.

Seven churches were opened for special services during the week—three for early Communion each day,—one on the Tuesday, one on the Wednesday and Friday, one twice every day,—and that of St. Paul, daily, for plain celebration at 7, and Choral Celebration at 8 a.m.

The Executive Committee early thought it desirable to give general circulation to the following rule:—"The Executive Committee recommend that members discountenance all extraneous meetings during the session of Congress." And this Rule, whilst it gave offence to a society that was very desirous of having its principles discussed, doubtless tended greatly to the concentration of the public mind on the special business of the Congress itself.

The labours of the Reception and Finance Committee must not be overlooked in this brief record; for not only were they successful in providing an admirable Hall for the meetings at a moderate cost, but the arrangements made for the accommodation of members were such as have never before been excelled. A large Conversation, Reading, and Writing Room, Retiring and Refreshment Rooms contiguous to the great Hall, were provided; so that nothing was wanting to the comfort and accommodation of visitors.

An account of the great meeting for Working men will be found at page 388. Invitations to this were given through the Clergy and churchwardens, and the principal employers of labour in the town; and the platform was reserved for 300 members, who received tickets in order of application; but a much larger number found their way in.

It remains now only to take notice of the very agreeable Soirée with which the Congress ended, and to which all the members and holders of Congress tickets were admitted. The whole suite of rooms of the Hartley Institution were thrown open for the occasion, and a numerous and brilliant company attended. Refreshments were supplied in the Museum.

In the large Lecture Hall, which was decorated with a choice collection of plants and flowers from the nurseries of Messrs. Oakley, a miscellaneous concert of vocal and instrumental music was held. In the new rooms of the School of Art many drawings of the students were displayed; the three upper rooms of the Institution were devoted to the exhibition of Electric, Telegraphic, and other instruments, of interesting microscopic objects, and of chemical experiments. But the great interest of the evening was centred in the Library and Reading room, where Major-General Sir Henry James, R.E., Director General of the Ordnance Survey, had most kindly placed large models of the great pyramid of Egypt, showing the details of the interior construction of that gigantic sepulchral monument, which he explained to the Company. Here were also models, plans, and photographs of the Ordnance Surveys of Jerusalem, and of Sinai, which were explained by Captains Wilson and Palmer, the officers of the Royal Engineers under whom the surveys were made. The photographic views in and about Jerusalem, and in the neighbourhood of Sinai were projected on a screen by the electric light under the direction of Captain Parsons, R.E. The photographs, which were of a most excellent character, were shown by Sergeant-Major Macdonald, R.E., who took them himself.

If great praise is due, as it unquestionably is, to the two Honorary Secretaries of Congress, the Rev. A. B. Burton and R. C. Hankinson, Esq., for their unwearied exertions from first to last, it would be difficult to find words adequately to express the gratitude, not only of all the Committees, but of the whole members, to the President, as well for his eloquent and earnest Inaugural Address, as for his consummate tact and judgment in the conduct of this last, but not least interesting, of the ten Church Congresses which have been held. It may be that the financial success has not been equal to the sanguine expectations of the promoters, yet it is felt that great benefit cannot but result to the Church from the free interchange of opinion upon questions of absorbing interest, by men of very different minds and of very different schools, meeting on the common platform of the Reformed Catholic Church of England; and herein the original promoters of this Congress find their reward.

J. W. C.

STANDING RULES.

It may be useful to append here certain Rules, which have been agreed upon at different Congresses, and which seem to be of permanent value.

At Oxford, in 1864, it was resolved :—

I.—That the object of Church Congresses was to bring members of the Church of England together for free deliberation, and for the exchange of opinion and experience, on subjects which affect the practical efficiency of the Church, the removal of abuse and defect, and the means of defence and extension ; also for the encouragement of a general interest in these and kindred subjects amongst the Clergy and Laity in different parts of the country.

II.—At the same meeting it was determined—

1. That the discussion of points of theological doctrine and speculation be strictly excluded.

2. That no question arising out of any papers read, or subject treated at any general or sectional meeting, be put to the vote.

3. That the discussion of each question be introduced by papers, or prepared speeches, limited in length at the discretion of each local Committee ; but that ample time (ordinarily not less than two-thirds) be reserved in each session for free and open debate.

N.B.—At Southampton, the Committee ruled that three readers of papers should be allowed twenty minutes each,—that those who delivered addresses, whether written or otherwise, should not exceed fifteen minutes,—and that all subsequent speakers should have ten minutes each.

4. That the Congress meet for three days or more, at such time as shall be arranged by concert between the standing and local Committees ; the next place of meeting being in each case decided by the Congress itself.

5. That the proceedings shall be opened by Divine service, with a sermon, the arrangements for which, as well as for daily service (in-

cluding Holy Communion), at such times and places as shall be convenient for those attending Congress, shall be made by the local Committee.

III.—It was resolved—

1. That the Chairman of the Committee, and the Hon. Secretaries of the three Congresses last preceding, together with the Chairman and Hon. Secretaries of the Committee for the next coming Congress, shall form a Committee for reference and consultation with the local Committee.

2. That as soon as possible, after the next place of meeting is decided, a Local Committee shall be formed, to which the entire arrangements of the Congress, subject to the foregoing standing rules, shall be entrusted.

3. That in all Executive Committees, whenever practicable, the number of Lay members and Secretaries shall be at least equal to the Clerical members and Secretaries.

At the Norwich Congress, held in 1865, the Committee recommended—

That the Bishop of the Diocese where each future Congress is held, shall be President.

And further,—

That the members of the Church (now the Churches) of England and Ireland alone will be permitted to address the Congress, and that no person will be allowed to speak twice on the same subject.

That all questions of order of proceedings will be in the discretion of the President or presiding Chairman, whose decision will be final.

That any member desirous of addressing Congress on the subject before the meeting, shall give his card to the Secretary in attendance before the conclusion of the written addresses, and await the call of the Chairman.

That every speaker shall address the Chair only, and shall confine himself strictly to the subject under discussion.

Patron.

His Grace The Right Honourable and Most Reverend The LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

President.

The Right Reverend The LORD BISHOP OF WINCHESTER.

Vice-Presidents.

The Right Reverend BISHOP SUMNER.

The Lord Archbishop of York
The Lord Archbishop of Armagh
The Lord Archbishop of Dublin
The Lord Bishop of Bangor
The Lord Bishop of Bath and Wells
The Lord Bishop of Carlisle
The Lord Bishop of Chester
The Lord Bishop of Chichester
The Lord Bishop of Cork
The Lord Bishop of Ely
The Lord Bishop of Hereford
The Lord Bishop of Limerick
The Lord Bishop of Llandaff
The Lord Bishop of Manchester
The Lord Bishop of Meath
The Lord Bishop of Oxford
The Lord Bishop of Peterborough
The Lord Bishop of Rochester
The Lord Bishop of St. David's
The Lord Bishop of Salisbury
The Lord Bishop of Tuam
The Right Rev. The Suffragan Bishop of Dover
The Right Rev. Bishop Ryan
The Very Rev. The Dean of Chester
The Very Rev. The Dean of Chichester, F.R.S.
The Very Rev. The Dean of Durham
The Very Rev. The Dean of Guernsey
The Very Rev. The Dean of Jersey
The Very Rev. The Dean of Salisbury
The Very Rev. The Dean of St. Asaph
The Very Rev. The Dean of St. Paul's
The Very Rev. The Dean of Westminster
The Very Rev. The Dean of Winchester.
The Very Rev. The Dean of York.
The Rev. The Warden of Winchester.
The Ven. The Archdeacon of Surrey.
The Ven. The Archdeacon of Winchester
The Ven. The Archdeacon of Ely
The Worshipful The Chancellor of the Diocese
The Rev. Canon Carus
The Rev. Canon Wilson
The Rev. Canon Gregory, } Proctors for
The Rev. George H. Sumner, } the Clergy.
The Rev. Canon Prothero
The Rev. The Rural Deans of the Diocese
The Mayor of Southampton
The Earl of Carnarvon
The Earl of Heytesbury
The Earl of Malmesbury
The Earl of Normanton
The Earl Nelson
Viscount Eversley
Lord Northbrook
Sir W. Heathcote, Bart.
Sir Nelson Rycroft, Bart.
Sir H. Mildmay, Bart.
The Hon. H. Curzon
The Hon. R. Dutton
The Hon. J. Dutton
The Hon. Col. Calthorpe
The Right Hon. Russell Gurney, M.P.
P. M. Hoare, Esq., M.P.
The Right Hon. W. F. Cowper-Temple, M.P.
Lord Henry Scott, M.P.
The Mayor of Guildford
The Mayor of Ryde
W. W. Beach, Esq., M.P.
G. Sclater Booth, Esq., M.P.
Charles Buxton, Esq., M.P.
George Dunlop, Esq., J.P., Sheriff of the County of the Town of Southampton
Henry Compton, Esq.
George Cubitt, Esq., M.P.
W. Fairbairn, Esq., High Sheriff of the County
J. B. W. Fleming, Esq.
J. Carpenter Garnier, Esq.
The Right Hon. Gathorne Hardy, M.P.
A. J. B. Beresford Hope, Esq., M.P.
Walter S. Long, Esq.
Stuart Macnaghten, Esq.
W. Nicholson, Esq., M.P.
Melville Portal, Esq.
W. S. Portal, Esq.
W. Stone, Esq., M.P.
W. B. Simmonds, Esq., M.P.
P. C. Trench, Esq.

General Committee.

Chairman.—THE PRESIDENT.

CLERGY.

Rev. A. Bradley
,, H. B. Bousfield
,, F. G. Burnaby
,, A. C. Blunt
,, E. J. Boyce
,, G. S. Barrow
,, J. D. Bolton
,, J. Bullen
,, E. Bradley
,, E. L. Berthon
Hon. and Rev. S. Best
Rev. C. Balston
,, S. Bridge
,, Mark Cooper
,, Dr. Cary
,, R. C. Callender
,, C. Collier
,, E. Carlyon
,, J. Compton
,, G. H. Connor
,, J. Durrant
,, J. S. Davies
,, H. Dupont
,, T. L. O. Davies
,, W. S. Dumergue
,, F. Davidson
,, G. Davies
Rev. J. Haigh
,, R. P. Hutchison
,, W. D. Harrison
,, W. Hulton
,, W. P. Hulton
,, Dr. Hatherell
,, R. Harvey
,, G. T. Hoare
,, R. E. Harrison
,, J. G. Joyce
,, Canon Kingsley
,, J. Morley Lee
,, W. H. Lucas
,, Gibson Lucas
,, P. Lewis
,, J. Marriott
,, Dr. Millard
,, J. Monkhouse
,, Dr. Monsell
,, J. F. Moor
,, F. W. Mant
,, G. N. Phillips
,, G. A. Procter
,, A. Poole
,, H. A. Plow
,, J. Ryan
,, F. Russell
Rev. Dr. Ridding
,, G. W. Southouse
,, H. W. Sheppard
,, W. Sealy
,, G. H. Sumner
,, A. Sedgwick
,, A. P. Salusbury
,, B. Smart
,, C. E. Steward
,, J. Sapte
,, J. H. Titcomb
,, T. H. Tragett
,, C. B. Turner
,, W. Woodhouse
,, C. W. Wilson
,, B. Westbrook
,, R. F. Wilson
,, F. E. Wigram
,, H. Wray, Precentor of Winchester
,, C. E. Wilkinson
,, T. Walpole
,, W. Warburton
,, G. Williams
,, J. Young

LAITY.

Atherley, G. A., Esq.
Atkins, E., Esq.
Browell, Capt., R.N.
Bassett, R. G., Esq.
Bernard, J., Esq.
Baldock, W., Esq.
Barton, A., Esq.
Buchan, H. J., Esq.
Bishop, J., Esq.
Bond, F. T., Esq., M.D.
Bevan, F. R., Esq.
Coote, Rear-Admiral
Coles, R., Alderman
Creed, T., Mr.
Coxwell, E., Esq.
Duncan, J., Esq.
Driver, Rolles, Esq.
Day, C. A., Esq.
Dunlop, Geo., Esq.
Elliott, J., Esq.
Esdaile, W. C. D., Esq.
Elliott, T. C., Esq.
Greenfield, W. B., Esq.
Green, H., Esq.
Gillett, W. S., Esq.
Humphrys, W. C. Esq.
Jellicoe, C., Esq.
Lacy, Col.
Langstaff, C., Esq., M.D.
Le Feuvre, J. E., Esq.
Lees, A. H., Esq.
Lake, G. A. K., Esq., M.D.
Mayes, Alderman
Maclean, W. C., Esq., M.D.
Moberly, W. H., Esq.
Naghten, A. R., Esq.
Oke, R. R., Esq.
Patterson, A. F., Esq.
Reynardson, Col.
Raikes, C., Esq., C.S.I.
Sharland, W., Esq.
Shipley, Conway, Esq.
Smith, N. Bowden, Esq.
Stebbing, J. R., Esq.
Stevens, R. G., Esq.
Tylee, Chas., Esq.
Tryon, Major General
Trench, P. C., Esq.
Wilkin, H. C., Esq.
Wells, General

Rev. Alex. B. Burton, M.A., } Hon. Secs.
R. C. Hankinson, Esq., }

Executive Committee.

Chairman.—WYNDHAM S. PORTAL, ESQ.

Vice-Presidents.

The Archd. of Winchester
The Archdeacon of Surrey
Rev. Canon Wilson
The Hon and Rev. S. Best
The Rev. Canon Gregory
The Rev. Canon Kingsley
The Rev. The Warden of Winchester.
The Mayor of Southampton
Stuart Macnaghten, Esq.

Committee.

CLERGY.

Rev. A. Bradley
,, H. B. Bousfield
,, F. G. Burnaby
,, A. C. Blunt
,, E. J. Boyce
,, E. L. Berthon
,, Mark Cooper
,, Dr. Cary
,, J. Compton

Rev. J. Silvester Davies
,, J. Haigh
,, W. D. Harrison
,, J. G. Joyce
,, J. Morley Lee
,, W. H. Lucas
,, Dr. Millard
,, G. A. Procter

The Precentor of Winchester
Rev. F. Russell
,, George H. Sumner
,, C. W. Wilson
,, R. F. Wilson
,, F. E. Wigram
,, George Williams
,, W. Warburton

LAITY.

Atkins, E., Esq.
Browell, Captain, R.N.
Bond, F. T., Esq., M.D.
Bassett, R. G., Esq.
Barton, Alfred, Esq.
Compton, H., Esq.
Coote, Rear-Admiral
Coles, Alderman R.
Duncan, J., Esq.

Driver, Rolles, Esq.
Elliott, John, Esq.
Esdaile, W. C. D., Esq.
Green, H., Esq.
Jellicoe, C., Esq.
Lacy, Lieut. Colonel
Langstaff, C., Esq., M.D.
Le Feuvre, J. E., Esq.

Lees, A. H., Esq.
Lake, G. A. K., Esq., M.D.
Maclean, W. C., Esq., M.D.
Nelson, Earl
Stebbing, J. R., Esq.
Smith, N. Bowden, Esq.
Trench, P. C., Esq.
Tylee, Charles, Esq.

Rev. Alex. B. Burton, M.A.,
R. C. Hankinson, Esq., } Hon. Secs.

Sub-Committees.

I.—For Selecting Subjects, Readers, and Speakers.

Chairman.—Earl Nelson.

Rev. Dr. Cary
,, Mark Cooper
,, Canon Gregory
,, W. D. Harrison
,, John Haigh
,, J. G. Joyce
,, John Compton

Rev. Geo. H. Sumner
,, Geo. Williams
,, R. F. Wilson
Elliott, John, Esq.
Coote, Rear-Admiral
Driver, Rolles, Esq.
Esdaile, W. C. D., Esq.

Lake, G. A. K., Esq., M.D.
Tylee, C., Esq.
Lees, A. H., Esq.
Maclean, W. C. Esq., M.D.
Macnaghten, Stuart, Esq.

With President, and Chairman and Secretaries of Executive Committee, *ex officiis.*

Rev. W. D. Harrison, M.A.,
Rolles Driver, Esq., } Hon. Secs.

II.—Reception and Finance.

Chairman.—F. Perkins, Esq., Mayor of Southampton.

Rev. A. C. Blunt
,, F. G. Burnaby
,, Dr. Cary
,, G. A. Procter
Bassett, R. G., Esq.

Jellicoe, Chas., Esq.
Lacy, Col.
Coles, R., Esq.
Barton, A., Esq.
Langstaff, C., Esq.

Bond, F. T., Esq., M.D.
Atkins, E., Esq.
Browell, Capt., R.N.
Stebbing, J. R., Esq.

With Chairman and Honorary Secretaries of Executive Committee, *ex officiis.*

Rev. F. G. Burnaby, M.A.,
J. E. Le Feuvre, Esq., } Hon. Secs.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 11.

PAGE
SERMON, by the Bishop of Salisbury 3
SERMON by the Bishop of Oxford 15
INAUGURAL ADDRESS, by the Bishop of Winchester 23

FOREIGN MISSIONARY EFFORTS OF THE CHURCH :—

PAPERS : — Rev. Chancellor Massingberd 29
Rev. Dr. F. Hessey ... 34
Rev. Canon Fremantle ... 43
ADDRESSES : — Sir Bartle Frere, K.C.B. 45
Bishop of Madras... ... 49
DISCUSSION :—Rev. the Warden of St. Augustine's... ... 53
Rev. G. W. Hills 54
Bishop MacDougall ... 55
Rev. W. H. Lucas ... 56
Rev. J. R. Madan... ... 57
Archdeacon Emery ... 58

AGENCIES FOR THE KINDLING AND REVIVAL OF SPIRITUAL LIFE :—

PAPERS :—Rev. Prebendary Humphry 60
Rev. R. M. Benson ... 66
Rev. Emilius Bayley ... 71
ADDRESSES :—H. F. Bowker, Esq. 76
Rev. Richard Twigg ... 79
DISCUSSION : — Rev. W. D. Maclagan 82
C. L. Higgins, Esq. ... 83
Rev. George Body ... 84
Rev. J. H. Titcomb ... 85
Rev. Edgar Jacob... ... 86
Thomas Chambers, Esq., Q.C., M.P. 88
Rev. W. H. C. Luke ... 89
Rev. S. Gedge 90
Rev. George Williams ... 91
W. E. Shipton, Esq. ... 92

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 12.

DUTY OF THE CHURCH AS TO ELEMENTARY EDUCATION :—

PAPERS :—Rev. A. R. Ashwell ... 93
Rev. B. Morgan Cowie ... 99
A. J. B. Beresford Hope, Esq., M.P. 106
PAGE.
ADDRESSES :—Rev. Canon Walsham How 111
Right Hon. W. F. Cowper Temple, M.P. 113
DISCUSSION : — Rev. Canon Melville 115
Bishop of Oxford 117
Earl Beauchamp 118
Bishop Suffragan of Dover 120
J. H. Kennaway, Esq., M.P. 121
Rev. J. B. Sweet 122
Rev. H. Brass 123
Rev. J. Erskine Clarke ... 124
Rev. C. D. Goldie... ... 125

LAY REPRESENTATION IN CHURCH SYNODS AND CONFERENCES :—

PAPERS :—Bishop of Salisbury ... 126
Rev. J. Wayland Joyce ... 132
Archdeacon Utterton ... 139
ADDRESSES :—Sir Antonio Brady 145
Rev. Berdmore Compton 148
DISCUSSION :—Sir John Awdry ... 152
Rev. James Moorhouse ... 153
Rev. F. H. Cox 154
A. J. B. Beresford Hope, Esq., M.P. 156
Archdeacon Churton ... 157
Thomas Chambers, Esq., Q.C., M.P. 157
Rev. R. G. Peter 159
J. Carpenter Garnier, Esq. 160
Rev. Dr. Harrison ... 161
Rev. J. B. Sweet 162
Rev. W. Pound 163
Rev. R. Seymour 163

CHARITABLE RELIEF AND CHURCH WORK :—

PAPERS :—Rev. James Amos ... 164
Alsager Hay Hill, Esq. ... 169
Rev. Prebendary Thorold 176
ADDRESS :—Wyndham S. Portal, Esq. 180
DISCUSSION : — Rev. Theophilus Bennett 183
E. W. Hollond, Esq. ... 184
Hon. and Rev. S. Best ... 186
Rev. Thomas Richardson 187
J. Shaw Stewart, Esq. ... 189
Rev. Emilius Bayley ... 190
Rev. Dr. Monsell 192
Rev. C. H. Rice 194
Rev. T. H. Clark 195
C. L. Higgins, Esq. ... 196
Rev. R. Allen 196

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 13.

CHRISTIAN ANTIQUITY AND CHURCH RITUAL :—

PAGE
PAPERS :—Archdeacon Freeman ... 197
Mr. J. Elliott 203
Rev. T. W. Perry... ... 216
ADDRESS :—Rev. Dr. Harrison ... 223
DISCUSSION :—Rev. G. H. Sumner 227
Rev. Dr. Littledale ... 228
Rev. J. C. Ryle 230
Rev. C. F. Lowder ... 232
Rev. G. Everard 233
Rev. R. F. Wilson ... 235
Rev. F. F. Goe 236
Rev. Mayow W. Mayow ... 237
Rev. H. B. W. Churton ... 238
Rev. R. C. Billing... ... 239
Rev. C. D. Goldie ... 240
Rev. W. W. Malet ... 240
Rev. C. P. Phinn 241

PHYSICAL SCIENCE AND BIBLICAL CRITICISM :—

PAPERS :—Rev. J. H. Titcomb ... 243
Rev. Dr. Hannah 247
Rev. E. Garbett 253
ADDRESS :—Rev. Professor Rawlinson 259
DISCUSSION :—Dr. Evans 263
Rev. George Williams .. 263
Rev. Canon Kingsley ... 265
Rev. W. E. Littlewood ... 266
Archdeacon Freeman ... 268
Rev. F. Arnold 269
Sir Antonio Brady ... 271
C. L. Higgins, Esq. ... 272

DUTY OF THE CHURCH AS TO MIDDLE-CLASS EDUCATION :—

PAPERS :—J. G. Talbot, Esq., M.P. 274
Rev. Professor Plumptre 279
Rev. Canon Gregory ... 286
DISCUSSION :—Bishop of Oxford ... 293
A. J. B. Beresford Hope, Esq., M.P. 295
Archdeacon Emery ... 296
Bishop Ryan 298
Rev. Theophilus Bennett 300
Rev. A. R. Ashwell ... 302
Rev. G. C. Harris ... 303
Rev. G. R. Mackarness ... 305
Earl Nelson 307

FRIDAY, OCTOBER 14.

CHRISTIAN UNITY. PART I. REFORMED CHURCHES, GREEK AND EASTERN CHURCHES :—

PAGE
PAPERS :—Earl Nelson 308
Rev. F. S. May 312
Archdeacon Churton ... 319
ADDRESSES :—John Pearson, Esq., Q.C. 326
Rev. George Williams ... 329
DISCUSSION :—Bishop Ryan ... 332
Rev. R. W. Randall ... 334
Rev. Canon Fremantle ... 336
Rev. Dr. Littledale ... 337
Bishop McDougall ... 339
Rev. J. S. Jenkinson ... 340
Rev. W. W. Malet... ... 341
Rev. Chancellor Massingberd 342
Rev. H. B. W. Churton ... 343
Rev. E. Forbes 344

CHRISTIAN UNITY. PART II. NONCONFORMISTS :—

PAPERS :—Rev. P. G. Medd ... 346
Rev. J. C. Ryle 354
Rev. J. Moorhouse ... 360
ADDRESS :—Rev. George Body ... 369
DISCUSSION : — Bishop of Peterborough 372
Bishop Suffragan of Dover 374
A. J. B. Beresford Hope, Esq., M.P. 375
Rev. Professor Plumptre 376
Rev. Arthur Bradley ... 377
Rev. W. D. Maclagan ... 378
Archdeacon Utterton ... 379
Rev. G. H. Sumner ... 379
W. E. Shipton, Esq. ... 380

VOTES OF THANKS, etc. 382
WORKING MEN'S MEETING :—
Speeches by—The President ... 388
Canon Kingsley 391
Bishop of Peterborough... 394
Thomas Chambers, Esq... 398
Rev. W. R. Clark 399
Rev. J. Moorhouse .. 402
APPENDIX 404
LIST OF MEMBERS 408

SERMONS,

PREACHED IN THE CHURCH OF ALL SAINTS, SOUTHAMPTON,

BY THE RIGHT REV. THE LORD BISHOP OF SALISBURY;

AND

IN THE CHURCH OF HOLY RHOOD, SOUTHAMPTON,

BY THE RIGHT REV. THE LORD BISHOP OF OXFORD,

ON TUESDAY, OCTOBER 11TH, 1870.

THE SERMON

By the Right Rev. the LORD BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

"But I wrought for my Name's sake, that it should not be polluted before the Heathen."—*Ezek.* xx. 9, 14, 22.

The subject of the Evidences, as they are commonly called, of Christianity is one which, I freely confess, has at all times suggested to my mind considerable feelings of uneasiness. I have felt that in the way in which they are popularly regarded, and presented in the ordinary text-books, there is a sort of feebleness, a resting, as it were, upon mere logic, which has dissatisfied me. Thus the proof, while it seems entirely satisfactory to those who believe already, and who judge of the argument with a previous certainty of the truth of the conclusion, does not seem to my mind to be so really and inherently strong, as it ought to be in order to bear the weight which it professes to support, nor nearly so strong as I verily believe it to be in real truth.

This feeling, of which I have been more or less conscious in all my life, was brought to a painful distinctness on one occasion, when I found myself in conversation with a man of high intellectual powers and cultivation, not a Christian, but entirely, so far as I could judge, devoid of all prepossession either in favour of the Gospel or against it. When he put it to me, in the calmness of serious discussion, not as to a preacher, but as to a reasoner, 'Tell me, why, and on what grounds of argument and reason, I should become a Christian,' I confess that a large proportion of the usual array of what are called Evidences of the Gospel seemed to break down under me; not, God knows, that I felt the least doubt in the real blessed certainty of the conclusion, or the existence of the most perfect and irresistible proofs to support it, but because the usual method in which these proofs are presented seemed to me to strip them of half, or more than half, their true weight.

If I may venture to refer to words of my own, already printed two years since, I will quote the following observation: "We are content to believe that in an historical religion, the continuity of which extends over well nigh four thousand years, and of which every part and portion is essentially necessary to all the rest, it is a sound as well as an inevitable conclusion that God has given to every age the specific duty of determining those points which it alone had the means of determining; and that thus every single part of the whole connected scheme or fabric becomes a real evidence, and a satisfactory proof of all the rest."*

This observation is made, in the place where it occurs, in respect of the authority and inspiration of the Books of Holy Scripture. But it appears to me to be capable of a much more extended application, and to suggest what I think the truest and most satisfactory way of viewing the Evidences of Christian religion in general, and of its various details, as of Inspired Books, Miraculous Works, Prophecy, and others.

I am well aware that Converts are not made to the Gospel, nor souls saved in it, by *Evidences*. It is the Lord alone who by His Spirit opens the hearts of men to receive the preaching of Sin, of Righteousness, and of Judgment, the preaching of our deep need, of salvation purchased, and of the awful issue of the last Day.

Most true: but it is also most true that the Religion in which we live and desire to die, the Religion which we believe to be from God, and of which we endeavour to spread the knowledge over the furthest parts of the world, must have its roots in such sound and real Truth as is capable of being recognised and acknowledged, and, if need be, produced and urged in argument by sound and real Reason; and my inquiry this morning, Brethren, is one that would search into the general nature of these roots, and help, if it may, to point them out in their strength.

It has been, I think, too much the practice of writers on the Evidences to allow the thesis of the truth of the Gospel to be regarded as one which has to be proved, as a new thing, in every generation. Brought, as it were, to the bar at any or at every time, it has been required to bring up the whole array of its witnesses, each in its own single strength, to offer evidence for the cross-examination of advocates in attack or defence.

And the challenge has been accepted. Evidence, external and internal, miracle, prophecy, inspired books, honesty on the part of eye-witnesses, testified by devotion and sacrifice of life,—all these, and other things like these, have been marshalled in orderly form, and the logical inferences duly drawn to what has the appearance of a demonstrated conclusion.

---

* Bampton Lectures, 1868; 8th Lecture, p. 227 (2nd edit.).

The advantage has been all on the side of the attack. Miracles, performed very long ago, in the presence of people long since dead, performed in ages when the limits of natural and supernatural agency were much less recognised even than now,—miracles, alleged in the naked force of their own wonderfulness, and supported on the ground of the personal honesty of those who witnessed them,—I know not how to urge to one who will not believe them. What needs proof itself can hardly furnish the basis of proof to so mighty a superstructure as the Gospel of Christ.

The same is more or less the case with Prophecy. Nakedly alleged, and brought forward in direct and present evidence, it seems to be open to the same sort of objection. Can we absolutely prove, as in the case of a witness under searching cross-examination, its date, its exact words, its undeniable authorship?

Do we know enough of the history to pronounce with absolute confidence on the fulfilment? Are there no prophetic words which seem to lack their parallel in the after-history? Are there no particulars in the after-history which seem to be omitted in the prophecy? If it is to be brought up as a living present witness, is not its voice stammering and indistinct, capable of being in various ways depreciated by such as disown the personal and traditional prepossessions which in the minds of believers give it irresistible power?

I confess that I feel that there is an immense loss of real weight in the argument, when the Evidences are brought up in this way. In comparison with the real majestic Proof which the Gospel has to offer, the discussion, so conducted, seems to become petty, and open to all sorts of petty cavils, and the conclusions look more like those of a thin logic, than such as they ought to be, conclusions of an enormous and overwhelming cogency.

For I verily believe that the proof of the Gospel is, in its own real strength, absolutely overwhelming; and that proof lies, not in the naked array of arguments such as I have spoken of, brought forward in each generation as of present and immediate weight leading to a clear logical demonstration; but in the mighty Chain of Human History, which, beginning from the beginning of all we know of mankind, and running through the ages of his recorded being upon the Earth, testifies, as no array of living and immediate witnesses can possibly be conceived to testify, to the irrefragable Truth of the Religion of Christ.

And this is, brethren, the particular point to which I desire to call your attention to-day. I mean that the true Evidence of the Gospel lies in the long roll of its wonderful history, gemmed with miracles, guaranteed age after age by prophecies fulfilled, beginning from the very beginning of man as a Creature whose moral being and doings are recorded for the knowledge of posterity, held together by the continuity of a long descended faith, full of Saints, bound by a clear continuous Providence, in an uninterrupted descent from the days of the most ancient Patriarchs to the Saints in Christ Jesus of the present day.

I could venture to say that this mighty Historical Chain, so long, so signal, so unequalled, carries with it its own evidence; that it lies over the entire Chart, so to speak, or map of historical humanity, with a completeness and a strength so great and so unbroken as to vindicate itself and every link of which it is composed, even if the separate links have not, as they often have not, any living, independent, producible evidence by which they may severally be proved. Does any one call in question the narrative of this or that miraculous event in the Old or New Testament? The mighty fabric of Truth from the fall of Adam to the bright daylight of the Church of Christ in which we live, of which it forms a necessary and integral part, is its sufficient and irresistible support. Does any one challenge the divineness of this or that writing, embodied in the long religious history of the Truth, the Chain of God's dealings with man in all the world? May be, I cannot now produce evidence which, independently of all around it, shall demonstrate it to be the Divine writing which I think it. But the place, the necessary place, which it holds in that indissoluble Chain of the Truth, guarantees its sacredness. The Book of Job, the Prophecy of Daniel, the Gospel of St. John, the Epistles of St. Peter, are guaranteed to me as Divine by the whole course of that marvellous history in which they are imbedded,—that history, which forms the brightest, longest, most undeniable, most conspicuous series of facts in the history of the world.

Sometimes indeed it happens that when the Sacred History comes into contact with the Profane, collateral light is thrown upon the Divine record from the Human: sometimes, as in the case of the Assyrian inscriptions, or some of the recent discoveries of travellers in the Holy Land, sudden light, bright as a sunbeam, and authentic as the sun-painting of a photograph, is thrown upon some ancient and long-hidden link of the great Chain. But even where such confirmation is wanting, as in the great majority of cases it must be, not only does the general strength of the whole vindicate the particulars,—not only does the visible force of the facts which we see with our eyes, and know with our certain knowledge, guarantee the reality of those which are passed out of sight,—but it is also an essential incident of such an historical continuity that each age should be held to be competent, because it alone has had the power, and therefore the duty of determining the reality of those things which belong to its own time. It was a very ancient generation which alone could pronounce upon the Inspiration of the Book of Job, or the reality of the miraculous passage of the Jordan; but the Book and the miracle are now welded into their own place in the firm Historical Chain, and every part of it is guaranteed, and effectually established by the irresistible whole.

By that great Historical Chain, of which I have thus spoken, I mean the long record of God's dealings with His chosen people; and to some of the characteristic particulars of that long record, as illustrating its pre-eminent evidential force, I wish to call your attention, brethren, for a short time.

Opening with a Cosmogony, wonderfully contrasted in its simple and Divine simplicity both of incident and language with the Cosmogonies of the nations, it supplies in a few verses the only account ever offered of the mixed nature of man, naturally good but historically enfeebled; aspiring to holiness, yet become incapable of reaching it; practically exiled from God, yet not without a longing to get back to Him. In these same verses it also opens the prospect of a restoration to be brought about by a Person, a restoration as wide as the original taint, but as much more effectual as the bruising of the head is greater than the bruising of the heel.

A record of a few generations follows, simple and devoid of the colouring of fable which universally deforms the tale of the birth and early history of nations; and we reach, in orderly series of onward narrative, the Flood,—the distant and shadowy tradition of which seems to be like a Cloudland out of which flow the beginnings of the stories of other peoples and countries.

Again, a few generations,—little more than names, but unquestionably historical,—and we come to the Story of Abraham.

We are, be it observed, here in the earliest infancy of history; some two thousand years before Christ, long before the very first beginnings of authentic or anything like chronological history elsewhere. The father of the Chosen race, the Friend of God, the man selected in order to bring about the fulfilment of the original promise, is no great monarch or powerful chief. He is a wanderer, landless, of no mark, so far as we know, among his contemporaries.

To him God is pleased to announce that in the line of a son, yet unborn and unbegotten, He would raise up in some distant age a Descendant in whom all nations of the Earth should be blessed.

With that promise, the Chosen Nation, to be wonderfully kept and preserved in the after-ages, has begun to be. In the third generation it widens into the twelve Patriarchs, and from that time it has the beginnings of its growth.

For some time it is, as it were, in its cradle. It passes through a troubled and painful infancy, till in the Exodus from Egypt, the deliverance of the Red Sea, the sojourn in the Wilderness, and the occupation of the Promised Land under Moses and Joshua, the Nation, already and long designated in its people, becomes localized in its home in Palestine.

In that home that people lived on for not less than fifteen hundred years,—the most marvellous national life that ever has been lived in the world.

Marvellous in many ways, comparatively few in number, living in a corner, surrounded by powerful nations, falling temporarily under the power of conquerors, yet never losing for long their independence, and never losing at all their natural and separate being, —this one Nation never blended with any other. Its religion, its laws, its traditions, its borders, its blood, its books, were all its own. Other nations might hear of them, might respect or despise them, but they lived on, as a stream flowing through a vast lake, without mingling with alien waters.

For 1500 years, longer by far than any nation of which we have any certain historical knowledge, and under circumstances in no way outwardly favourable, as it might seem, to such isolation, the Children of Israel yet held their own. Their certain annals begin not less than 700 years before the foundation of Rome, or the beginning of trustworthy chronological history in Greece.

And was this strange continuance and isolation of a small race and nation merely a curiously single phenomenon in the history of the world, or was it an express and ordained method by which God designed to bring to pass a great End? Read the 20th chapter of the Prophecy of Ezekiel, the first lesson for next Sunday morning,—read it in connection with the 16th of the same prophecy, for an answer to such a question. Read how, though they were an evil generation, "their father was an Amorite and their mother a Hittite," and they were cast away like an unpitied infant, God passed by and bade them *live*. Read how time after time, in all the history of their impenitency and backslidings, God wrought for His Name's sake that they should not be polluted before the heathen. Though time after time it came into their hearts that they would fain have been as the heathen, as the families of the countries, to serve wood and stone; yet God kept them in their wonderful continuity and isolation for a definite End and Purpose, till there should be born of that blood, under that law, in that land, in a certain fulness of time, a *Son*, in whom not they only, but all the Nations of the Earth should be blessed.

To that Son, the Seed of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the whole national life and being of that wonderful people pointed. The whole fabric of the religious Law shadowed Him in rites and ceremonies; all the economical arrangements of the Civil Law, in respect of tribe, of intermarriage, of reverting inheritances and the like, were framed in order to keep His descent clear and unmistaken; prophet after prophet (however neglected or persecuted during life, yet after death recognised as having spoken the word of the Lord) added fresh particulars of His birth, His birthplace, His parentage, the time of His advent.

All through these long ages, though generation after generation died without seeing the fulfilment of the promises, every child of Israel knew perfectly well that to them, and to none but them, the sovereignty of the whole world was due. The blessing of Abraham was to spread over all mankind. The knowledge of Jehovah, their God, was to cover the whole Earth as the waters cover the Sea. In the last days,—those last days to which the faithful people never ceased to look forward,—the mountain of the Lord's house should be established in the top of the mountains, and people should flow into it. And many nations should come and say, Come and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord and to the home of the God of Jacob, and He will teach us of His ways and we will walk in His paths; for the Law shall go forth of Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. Utterly unswerving, utterly unshaken,—even though mistaken in the nature of the promised sovereignty,—was the conviction which possessed every individual of that marvellously protected and preserved people, that in that Anointed One, that Child of Abraham, that Son of David, should be seen the Antitype to all the Priests of the Law, to all the Prophets, and when kings were given, to all the Kings of the Nation; *the Man*, on whose shoulder the Government should be, who might without blasphemy be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace; of the increase of whose government there should be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even for ever.

Through all those long ages, while all the rest of the world lay almost literally in darkness and the shadow of death, given up to Polytheism and Idolatry, and to every sort of foul and abominable wickedness,—that one Nation, though constantly longing for the gods and the ways of the heathen around them, held fast to the great Central Truth of the Unity of God, and were, as a Nation, the single pure and moral nation in the world. Their written law, and the words of the Prophets, spoken and written, were so full of high morality, that the very Sermon on the Mount, the very code of perfect Christian morals does but re-echo their voice, even while it enlarges their scope and promise. *This is the Law and the Prophets!* And not morality only, but the most genuine expression of pure religion and piety. Look at the Book of Psalms, and remembering that David was not far from contemporary with Homer, consider that that book, written for the most part at that date, still continues to furnish the choicest, most spiritual, most elevating book of devotion in the world to the most cultivated and most holy of mankind, living under the fullest light of Christian revelation, and in the closest nearness to God in the Holy Spirit.

As I dwell thus, Brethren, upon a very few of the details of that wonderful history from the Call of Abraham to the Coming of Christ, it appears to me to come out with an evidential power, that, all prepossession and personal belief apart, is reasonably irresistible. If there be such a thing as moral proof, if it be conceivable that the finger of God can be clearly recognised in His dealings with men in the history of nations, then nowhere can it be seen so strongly or so undeniably as in that long Chain of near 2000 years, and in the preparation of the Jewish Nation and people to be the seed-plot of the Religion which was destined to conquer and restore the world.

And then the first long stage of the Divine work was done. The nation had been kept apart for 2000 years, and in the fulness of time the Child was born. He lived. He was rejected. He was crucified. The long tale of Prophecy and Type had its perfect fulfilment, but not in the sense which the people had fondly expected. His few followers, poor, unlearned, frightened, were scattered.

In three days He rose from the dead. The scattered disciples began to reassemble. A few days, and they counted by thousands.

The History of the world had begun again. A seed was sown, the smallest as it might seem of seeds. But it began at once to grow into the mightiest of trees. A new leaven was infused into human society, and at once, and in the most wonderful way, it began to leaven the whole lump.

But what of the Nation so wonderfully continuous and isolated during 2000 years? Did the after-history show that these remarkable traits of the long preceding ages were due to any inherent peculiarity in the people, their character, or their Institutions? Nay; that continuity and that isolation had done their work; and from that very generation to this day the very reverse of that continuity and isolation, the very contrary to everything that was peculiar in their previous wonderful history, has testified not less signally, not less undeniably, but now retrospectively and in a precisely opposite way, to the reality of the Salvation then wrought for mankind. For near 2000 more years that People has had no country, no government, no political being. Exiled from their ancient home, without Temple, or Sacrifice; known, domiciled among the nations, and blending with them in some degree, yet never losing their well-known countenance, habits, and strong faith in the ancient national promises; persecuted everywhere, yet everywhere rising to affluence, and the indirect power that belongs to affluence; wanderers of the world, rooting everywhere, but nowhere growing to any national completeness; testifying, in the absolute singularity of their scattering, to the Divineness of the prophetic judgment denounced upon them in case of their disobedience, by their own lawgiver above 3000 years ago; that scattered undying people seem to me to offer the most irresistible evidence of the Divine mission of the Christ whom they crucified, and the truth of the Gospel which they have rejected. "Slay them not, O God, lest my people forget it, but scatter them abroad, O Lord, our defence!"

And correspondingly to this awful scattering, but in wonderful contrast to it, has grown up the Edifice of the Christian Church. The Corn of wheat sown in the sacred soil has multiplied to infinite millions. The buried Christ, risen from the dead by the glory of the Father, is become the corner-Stone of a Temple, more sacred, more enduring, more glorious by far, than the Temple of Jerusalem: a Spiritual Temple, built up of Spiritual Stones, unlocalized, universal, wherein is contained all that is civilized, all that is true, all that is pure, all that is holy, all that is Divine upon the Earth.

No doubt the weakness and sinfulness of men still check in many ways, and interfere grievously with the full growth, and development in sacred unity, of the Holy Church. No doubt the so-called Christian Nations have but imperfectly taken into their heart and into their lives the deep and pure lessons, the sacred heart-searching doctrines of the Redemption, and the Indwelling, the holy, sanctifying realities of the faith which they profess; and as an inevitable consequence of such disunion and imperfection, the effects of their missionary work to the dark places of the Earth are comparatively feeble. Yet when every such deduction is made, and made even much more largely than truth requires, there stands, has stood, and, please God, will continue to stand, the Blessed Church of Christ. In spite of the world's opposition, in spite of the world's still more deadly friendship, equally fit to leaven and subdue every form of human polity, and every development of human civilization, teaching all pureness, all brotherhood, offering the only cure of the innumerable ills of life, opening Heaven to the simplest and most uncultivated, as well as to the most learned faith, it stands, its own witness, embodying within it all that is good and great, all that is holy and happy upon this lower Earth.

I know not, Brethren, what others may think. It may seem to some minds a satisfactory thing to draw up an array of arguments, external and internal, miracle, prophecy, testimonies of honest men and the like, as though the truth of the Gospel were a theorem to be demonstrated in each generation afresh by a perpetual series of ever-living and producible witnesses; just as, on the other side, objections of various kinds, arithmetical, scientific, critical, moral, philosophical, are continually brought forward to discredit, if it be possible, some part or other of the great scheme and system of Truth. To my own mind, in the face of the great Historical Chain of witness which, from the days of Abraham to this day, supports the Divine Truth of the Gospel, all such argumentation seems petty and trifling. The mighty truth seems to lie over and along the whole recorded history of mankind, and they who recognise it in all its reality and magnitude, will hardly care to go so minutely into the discussion of small details of the great series, as if consequences of much importance depended on them.

Yet let it be observed, that the majestic Evidence to which I have referred does not in any degree lead me to depreciate or lose sight of any one of the ordinary topics of proof, while it relegates them to their own historical place in the long Chain. Each miracle of ancient time stands in its own strength in that long series. It did its work in its own day. It was seen and judged of by those who witnessed it. It told with its own first and direct force upon its own present. From that time forth, in its still abiding secondary force, it forms an integral and indispensable part in the long tale of Truth. In like manner each prophecy, given for the comfort of generation after generation, having its immediate fulfilment in its own present, looking on to the First Advent, and through it to the Second, blends with the continuous Story, never losing its own proper evidential power, but witnessing in its own place, and continually, to the Divineness of the great Scheme. Every book, accepted in its own age by those who alone had the means, and therefore the duty of judging of it, mingles with the long History, entwined in its place inextricably with it, and forming a part of it which can never be separated.

Considerations such as these, which I have thus hastily endeavoured to put before you, Brethren, can hardly fail to suggest the extreme importance of History as a great staple of Christian education. If it be true, as I have tried to show, that Christian Evidence is so essentially historical, it is plain that History, in its breadth and length,—history, sacred and profane,—must be well known before the real intellectual basis of Christianity can be thoroughly mastered.

Other sorts of learning have their high religious, as well as secular value. Science, diligently and humbly pursued, may well lead a man, as he searches into the wonders of Creation, to recognise the wisdom and the goodness, the love and the power of the Almighty Creator; but its religious scope stops with these. It may impress on the thoughtful mind the great Truths of Natural Religion; but it leads no further. It does not go on to Christ. It neither shows the necessity of Redemption and Sanctification, nor the fact that they have been given.

To a man entirely ignorant of history you have no access in Christian argument, except through his personal conscience, his sense of sin, and his need of pardon. Abundantly sufficient these, no doubt, to turn millions of men to Christ, and to keep them in faithful allegiance to His kingdom and service; and altogether necessary, even with the intellectual aid of the most perfect historical knowledge, to keep the wilful hearts of men from wandering away, in the conduct of their lives, from the Truth that they are gifted with the means of discerning.

But we have to argue with others. We have to teach. We need to have fortresses, as it were, of intellectual strength, and weapons of intellectual power, to resist and baffle intellectual attack when it comes, as not unfrequently it may, against us.

And, I apprehend, we may sometimes need for our own comfort and support, to have recourse to similar strongholds of intellectual certitude. Sure I am that there are apt to be times when, from one cause or another bodily perhaps as well as mental, the *sense* of sureness seems to leave us; and, in the midst of the conflicts of argument, and the contemptuous unbelief by which we are surrounded, the thought rises, whether after all we may not be trusting more or less to subjective feelings than to outward realities,—whether we are not following rather the groove of an old tradition than recognising, in well-founded faith, an intellectual certainty.

I know not what others may feel. To my own mind the thought of the wonderful working of God in the long Historical Chain of which I have spoken,—the contemplation of the long isolation and continuity of the Jewish People in preparation of the Messiah, and their unexampled scattering since Messiah came,—joined with the building up of the Christian Church in their place;—and all this, gemmed as I said with Miracle, illustrated in Prophecy, recorded in Divine Books,—that thought has been one of a comfort and a strength that I myself have never found to fail, and which I earnestly commend to my Brethren.

THE SERMON

BY THE RIGHT REV. THE LORD BISHOP OF OXFORD.

"Endeavour to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace."—*Eph.* iv. 3.

No passage of Holy Scripture could have better struck the key-note of our conference than that which you have all heard in the Epistle for this week. "He exhorteth to unity," is the simple summary of it in the heading of the Chapter in our Bibles. The great Apostle delivered that exhortation with a power and cogency which his successors have never equalled, and may not hope to equal now. Yet on every one of them, in his place and degree, the burden of delivering it is laid,—laid by the same Master who had laid it on St. Paul before. I do not know that there could be any account given of an Apostolic preacher's discharge of his duty to his hearers and to God, which would so shortly describe his proper fulfilment of it, as that summary I quoted just now;—"He exhorteth to unity." May God of His mercy grant some increase of unity among His people who listen to the exhortations of His servants—and theirs—to day!

That the subject is suitable to these times, will readily be granted. It will be allowed by all, that a desire for unity has manifested itself much more powerfully among us than in some former generations. There is much talk of unity; and—though in this, as in other like cases, the talk outruns the genuine energy of heart—there is, no doubt, a true and earnest feeling underneath the talk. Men do see that a divided society is an imperfect society; that there can be no completeness in its form, nor sound health in its action, unless all its powers bend one way. Still more, when they remember such passages as this Chapter of St. Paul to the Ephesians, they are persuaded that the Church, above all other societies, is by its constitution tied to this unity. They recall the descriptions of it, given by its Divine Founder, as a sheepfold, a kingdom, or (yet more forcibly) as His own Body; and they conclude that unity is the very law and principle of its life. And when they look around them on a state of things which seems hopelessly confused, a company of believers in Christ no longer walking together as a company, but divided one from another, they ask if this be indeed the Church which Christ founded, His sheepfold and kingdom,—the Body of which He is the living Head.

These questions are so natural, they arise so obviously out of the letter of Holy Scripture, and commend themselves so warmly to loyal hearts, that it cannot be matter of wonder, if they have sorely perplexed many of the best and holiest of our friends. In nothing does the great Communion which ascribes Divine authority to the supposed successor of St. Peter find readier opportunities of proselytism than in the bold claim to the possession of unity which it maintains. Feebly and tentatively at first,—more boldly in ages when it was easy to forge testimony, and impossible to disprove it,—most peremptorily in these later times, when the accumulated precedents of ages seem to justify the wildest exaggerations of authority by success,—our Sister's claim to the exclusive note of unity has been urged. Others do not, cannot claim it as she does. No visible head elsewhere challenges the bold assertion so loudly made on behalf of one central figure there. One ruler of Christ's universal flock,—absolute in authority, unerring in doctrine, infinitely rich in treasures of grace, prodigal in dispensing them,—it is a majestic idea! It has almost everything to say for itself, but that it is true. Yet what wonder if, false though it be, it offers hope of rest and peace to troubled hearts? Here at least, they say, is the appearance of unity. Where else is it to be found? When its missionaries ply their pitiless logic, and heap contempt on the divisions of Christendom, holding up one central depository of all truth and knowledge and light, one central object of faith and adoration, as the solution of a desperate problem, the only escape from anarchy and schism, is it strange if some believe in the existence of what they wish to find, and bow down to the idea of a deliverer so skilfully adapted to their need ?

It is for us, Brethren, who are forbidden by reason and conscience, by theology and by history, to accept this solution, to see not merely where its fallacy lies, but what is the true idea of unity for which this strange substitute has been found. We should not desire so much to enter into controversy with Rome (controversy is never fruitful, seldom harmless), as to cherish in our own communion, and in our own hearts, true love for that unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace, which the Apostle bids us keep to-day.

This we shall do, as it seems to me, not by attempting, as some have unwisely done, to disparage or extenuate the importance of unity. To do so, is not only to play into the hands of our opponents, and make good their charges,—this were little,—but to be disloyal to Christ. No word can be spoken against the importance, nay the necessity, of oneness among His people which does not wrong Him, and contradict His truth. Rather let us hold more strongly than ever the sacredness of this law of Christian life. I would set it forth to you, not as *a* law, but *the* law, of the Church's being. It is common to speak as if Christ had founded His Church and Kingdom, and having founded it for certain ends and purposes, had then left to its members, among other commandments, this command, to be at one. Is it not more true to say, that He set up a kingdom, and founded a society, on earth for this one end above all others ? He gave a new commandment. He formed a company of a new sort of men, —men of one heart and mind. There never had been such a company before. Men had been bound together before in this place or that by patriotism, by religion, by ties of family and race. But it had never occurred to any one, that the motive for unity should be unity itself,—that men should be of one mind, not because they would be more successful when united, but because to be united was itself the perfection of human life, the guarantee and condition of all other excellence. "That they all may be one," was the blessing our Lord asked in that mysterious prayer, which described and foreshadowed the real nature of His kingdom. It was not a crowning gift to an existing brotherhood, but the very object and end for which such a brotherhood existed at all.

Therefore it was that the first great enterprise of Apostolic zeal was, to break down the partition wall between Jew and Gentile. From no other point of view can we appreciate the very strong language in which that change is often described. It is spoken of as a great mystery, kept secret from the beginning of time, now at last revealed to a chosen few, by them to be proclaimed to the wide world;—an extraordinary truth, which no one would have thought of or anticipated, until Christ made it known. So far as this part of the truth is concerned, the very success of the Gospel has made it almost impossible for us to estimate the greatness of the barrier it broke down. That Jew and Gentile should be united in one body, is now an axiom of Christianity; it seems to us the most natural thing in the world. To the first hearers of Christ's Gospel, it was a paradox to which the most earnest preaching, and the mightiest miracles, would hardly persuade them for a moment to attend.

On this head we need no instruction now. But do we understand that every other barrier was to be broken down as completely as this? Christ abolishes, or subdues, everything which hinders men from being of one mind. All kinds of prejudices, traditions, interests, old antipathies, new fashions,—all that makes men selfish, unloving, exclusive,—all that keeps them apart from one another, entrenched in their own strongholds of social or spiritual exclusiveness, be the name of it never so ancient or dignified, is inconsistent with our Master's purpose and prayer—"That they all may be one." No man rightly understands the meaning of the Gospel, and the power of the Cross, until he is possessed with a hearty desire for this union,—with a genuine abhorrence of all that hinders, or forbids, its attainment.

How, then, does this desire and longing, this earnest purpose, come? Not, Brethren, by argument and evidence, not by calculations of interest and motives of policy: it is not engendered of prudence or dictated by fear: persecution does not force men to entertain it: no constraint of authority is strong enough to prevent them from losing it;—it is "the unity of the Spirit:" it is wrought in the souls of the regenerate by the Spirit of God.

So it is not needful to find fault with the Church's Creeds, because one of them describes the Church Catholic as "Holy," the other as "One"; nor to go back to those Confessions of faith which recited her full title as the "One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church." For unity and holiness are two descriptions of the same condition. Unity in unrighteousness is a fallacy of polemics, a theologian's idle dream. Perfect unity there could not be without holiness; without the love of unity, holiness is but a name. To have a passionate longing for concord, is to long for heaven; for there are no divisions in that world. It is to have parted with all mean, personal aims, all projects of self indulgence, all jealousy of other men's success. It is to have the temper in which noble deeds are done, by which men live worthy lives. It is to be conformed to the charity of Christ.

Vain therefore it is and foolish to attempt to get back the Church's attribute of oneness by a display of outward submission to an earthly head. Scarcely less idle perhaps to seek it by conventions and treaties, by negotiations for amity, and agreements to differ. You might as well vindicate for the Church her attribute of holiness, by pleading some one man's representative sanctity; you might as well try to establish the reputation of a saint on some poor, palsied sufferer's inability to commit open sin. No; Brethren, this cannot be. The Church is Christ's Church still, though she is holy, not in virtue of the excellence of all her members, but, amidst much sinfulness of her children, potentially only and in her Master's design. She is Christ's Church still, though she is not, and never has been, united perfectly, as He willed. It is an imperfect unity; a poor, partial holiness;—the one as partial and imperfect as the other. You may cover her defect of holiness by an organised hypocrisy: you may persuade yourself that her unity is restored, when she has bowed the knee to a living idol. The truth remains, that she is not, in the one quality or the other, what her Master intended her to be. Just as no good man, even the best and holiest, reaches the Christian ideal of holiness, so neither does the Church ever reach Christ's pattern of unity and love. In projects of union and reconciliation we are but playing with the outside of the great question: not until the Holy Spirit stirs more deeply the heart of the Church, will there be true unity in her fold. Then, when yearnings after unity shall be accompanied with,—rather let me say, shall be identical with,—aspirations after holiness, when men shall grieve over a thought or word of unkindness far more sorrowfully than they grieve now for a stain upon their honour, they will wonder how such poor, inadequate, misguiding conceptions of unity should ever have blinded their forefathers' eyes, and led their judgment astray.

Seeing then, Brethren, that this earnest desire to be at unity is the very essence of Christian holiness,—seeing that it is a temper of mind, condition of heart, a character, an inward life,—what help in the attainment of it shall we have from the conference which is to assemble here to-day? They are flocking together—men of many minds, many various opinions, many conflicting tempers:—will their coming together tend to make them more united, with so many elements of disunion at work, such risks of misunderstanding and probabilities of mutual dislike? All depends on one condition. Are they assembled in Christ? It was He who first opened the very idea of unity to men, first brought them by example and precept to wish for it in some measure themselves. Only in the power of His Name, and by the operation of His Spirit, can men wish for it, and grow in it, now.

The success of a Church Congress depends on this. It may seem to depend on the eloquence of speakers, the satisfactory choice of subjects, the attractions of the place of meeting;—on these things, in a secondary and partial way, it *may* perhaps depend. But its true and essential success rests on each member's union with Christ, and, through this, on his longing for a united purpose, and a united sentiment, among all by whom Christ's Name is named on earth. At this moment, Brethren, the Church of this nation, our spiritual Mother that bore us, is in imminent peril. Not because her endowments are coveted, and her honours are regarded with jealousy; not because there may come a day when the dignity she has enjoyed a thousand years may be lightly set aside; not in these chances and changes does her peril stand. All this, and more, she can endure,—nay, in all this she can triumph, if only her children are at one. It is the growth, the rapid growth, of parties and rivalries among us which makes me tremble for her future, and sometimes half despair of her escape. I long to see men of all parties and schools more intent on the fulfilment of their Master's prayer, more simply and lovingly devoted to Him. I long to have party spirit looked upon as—what it is—an accursed thing. You have seen, in these last few weeks, the spectacle of a great nation rising in arms as one man, with a simplicity of earnest resolve, first to repel, and then to punish, an invader's attack. In all that mighty host there has seemed to be but one purpose: the murmurs of private interest or individual caprice, if there have been any, we do not hear. And shall the solemn earnestness of an armed nation awe us by its visible unity and its strong concentration of will, while the army of Christ lies scattered, disunited, incapable of energy in heart or act? Strange that there should be such resolute determination, such a bond of fellowship unto death, in those who undertake the savage business of war,—no unity among the soldiers of the Cross!

Brethren, I can desire no better result from this our great conference, than that we should learn to love one another more, be more united in Christ. It may be well to clear our views on the difficulties of Holy Scripture, to discuss the prospects of education, to consider improvements in Church organization, Church finance, and Church Services. But infinitely more important it is, that we should be of one heart. We may use our Lord's word in this connection, and say, "Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and all these things shall be added unto you." Some effect, I do hope and believe, these Congresses have in bringing about the blessed result I have described. It is something for strangers to become acquainted, for adversaries to exchange courtesies, for men of alien tastes and tempers to get their partial views of one another corrected, their prejudices, even for a time, disarmed. But this bond of peace is all too weak, unless the Spirit's unity hold together its sundered links, and give strength to the whole consecrated chain. Within you, Christians, dwells the power of love; for God planted it there, when He made you His own. For your renewed nature He has won such grace, that you may be indeed "one body and one spirit, as ye are called in one hope of your calling,"—one, even—O most awful and mysterious analogy!—even as God the Father and God the Son are One. When I turn from the contemplation of that ineffable Oneness to the spectacle of our broken unity, I am amazed and overwhelmed with shame at the sight.

Blessed Lord, who hast given Thy people so great capacity for love, such an exalted pattern of unity, finish Thine own work in us; make us truly and perfectly one in Thee!

TENTH ANNUAL MEETING
OF THE
CHURCH CONGRESS,
HELD AT SOUTHAMPTON.

TUESDAY AFTERNOON, 11*th* *OCTOBER*, 1870.

The Right Reverend the LORD BISHOP OF WINCHESTER took his seat as PRESIDENT, in the CONGRESS HALL, at 2.0 P.M., and delivered the following

INAUGURAL ADDRESS.

The inaugural words of one who opens now the sittings of the tenth Church Congress need not be many. On the general usefulness of such meetings, the Church has, by encouraging their repetition, pronounced its verdict: I shall therefore assume, that no defence of them is needed from me. What I would rather attempt to do—after welcoming here all who have come to us from afar, and assuring them that the labours of our Committee are and will be unsparing in seeking to promote their comfort—is to consider with you very briefly how we may best hope to avoid the dangers and secure the advantages of such a Gathering.

For this purpose it may be well first to remind ourselves of the definite Object for which we meet.

It is not to discover new Truths in the sacred deposit of which the Church is the appointed Guardian and Dispenser. It is not even, as to a great extent it is in the gatherings of Men of Science, to promulgate, scrutinise, and register the discoveries which have been made, that we assemble here. For such promulgation, scrutiny, and admission, there are other and more appropriate opportunities.

Our distinctive object (as it seems to me) may be defined to be the increase of the practical efficiency of our own branch of the Church universal:—I. By gaining a fuller understanding and a greater readiness in the use of the various parts of its existing spiritual and moral machinery. II. By (*a*) increasing, as the result of mutual consultation, the number of our instruments of service; (*b*) by improving their temper, strength, and edge; (*c*) as well as their application to our work by an increased elasticity in our system. III. And, I should say above all, by gaining, as the result of free personal intercourse, a larger, a more trusting, and so a more loving co-operation amongst ourselves, Laymen and Clergymen, in these particulars.

Let me illustrate what I mean by one or two additional remarks. "Conference," says the wise Lord Bacon, "maketh a ready man;"—and it effects this end, not so much by increasing his resources as by increasing his facility in using what he already has. For in conference, mind is brought to bear on mind; and not only is the store of one mind, its experience, its acquirements, and its resources, conveyed in large measure to others; but even the collision of mind with mind has its own great and useful effects. In the answering of questions, in the defence of positions, in the meeting of difficulties, half thoughts become thought thoroughly out; uses of instruments which lay dormant and unsuspected flash forth upon us, and we find ourselves possessed of a machinery of the use, or even existence, of which we had formerly no suspicion. Even as to the more outward and material part of our work this is true. It is true as to our power of using the resources of our existing institutions for the relief of the Physical wants of our people, for their education, for their civilization, for their training as citizens of the great commonwealth to which they belong.

But true as it is with regard to these departments of our work, it is perhaps truer still as to its higher branches. As to these we eminently need readiness in comprehending what the present time requires, and readiness in selecting and in using the proper instruments for meeting those requirements. The Citadel may be taken, though its armoury is full of weapons of defence, and though strong men are leagued together to protect it, if its defenders have never learned by practice a dexterous readiness in handling the arms which are provided for them. Now a general activity of the intellectual faculties does unquestionably mark our day. Men may differ widely as to the intellectual depth of the present time, when compared with earlier ages; but they can scarcely doubt that what used to be narrow streams are now wide, though they may be shallow inundations, or deny that a busy intellectual movement pervades well-nigh all Classes. Everything indeed around us seems to speak of the days when "many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased."

Such a general awakening may be a great gain. Whatever raises the intellectual life above the merely sensual is simply a blessing, to a man or to a people. But all awakenings, especially if they are somewhat sudden, have their peculiar dangers. Lethargy, indeed, is akin to death; awakening is full of life, but its first throb may be too strong for the vessels of the brain: men have, ere now, cast themselves down headlong to death, in the first mighty spasm with which returning consciousness has rushed in upon them. And when the awakening intellect first looks back upon the dull, lifeless, irreceptive torpor in which it has hitherto lain entranced, the revulsion of a natural indignation against the past is not without its perils. Instead of receiving (if that which is little better than passivity can be called receiving) with an impassive, unreproductive listlessness, everything presented to it, by tradition or assertion or authority, it now doubts and questions everything. At such a crisis, unless there be some guide capable of leading for the time the half-recovered consciousness, which discerns dimly the true relations between itself and the objects round it, "seeing men as trees walking," it is but too probable that it will fall into some strange, and it may be fatal, confusions.

This leading by the hand is the Church's true office. But then it must be ready to give at once, and with all friendly comprehension of his need, to the groping wanderer the help he wants. More especially is this needed, if there are many round him who would signally mislead him. For the discharge, therefore, of her highest office, for guiding the faith of men, the Church needs this readiness which is bred of Conference. It is not enough that we have deep thinkers, profound divines, men of thorough conviction and large knowledge; we must be ready to use that knowledge, and apply the results of that conviction, so as best to meet the needs of the present time—to bring forth things new and old—if we would fulfil the requirements of our office. The water in the inexhaustible well may be the purest, and the best; but unless it can be raised from its calm depth, and distributed to the thirsty, it might as well, for any practical purpose, be tainted and poisonous. The ever-changing play of life gives such new colours to old difficulties, that old answers will no more meet new objections than old firearms will fight modern battles.

We may then, I think, most assuredly conclude that the acquisition of the readiness which is bred of Conference should be one object of such a Gathering as this. This readiness in meeting difficulties is specially needed as to one set of subjects appointed for our discussion;—I mean the effect of the increased cultivation of physical science, and of literary and other research, on Biblical Criticism and Belief. He indeed must be a very poor Student of Christianity who thinks that she has any quarrel with Science or Literature; which, if not the twin offspring of her womb, the creation of her own prolific life, certainly owe to her their growth and advancement. But experience shows us that there have been literary and scientific men, who have been so misled as to deem of Christianity as the foe of their craft, and so to endeavour, in order to clear out of their way her fancied opposition, to assault her teaching and her rule. Against such assaults the instruments of reason and of knowledge have always hitherto, when used faithfully, achieved the victory; nor will they now fail us, if they be reset with all needful appliance for the wants of our present combat.

Another object therefore of our Gathering, which I have named to you, is such a multiplication and improvement of our instruments of service. This is even pre-eminently the work of a Congress. For through its discussions we may break through the ancient trammels with which dulness ever clogs improvement, and profit by the inventive genius which has been given to others and denied to ourselves. Through these discussions, we may find our empty hands furnished with weapons which others have had the skill to forge; whilst we correct our individual fancies by other men's experience, and find our own torpor stimulated by their successes. The subjects appointed for this Conference promise, I hope, much profitable discourse on this multiplication of our instruments of service, as to the great work of Christian Missions, and the yet greater need of kindling and reviving that Spiritual life at home from which all true work for God in foreign lands must spring; as to Synods,—as to systematic acts of Charity, and as to Education, both elementary and higher. For which of these great causes do we not need new machinery? As to which of them may we not confidently hope, that suggestions will be made, plans opened, sifted, and perfected,—needs revealed, with the fittest instruments for their supply exhibited,—which may send us all home to work as Laity and Clergy, in our several spheres of labour, fresh equipped with instruments, as well as fresh armed with hope? It is in this way that new elasticity may be given to our System. The want of elasticity must be one of the special needs of such a Community as ours. With its ancient and traditional institutions,—with laws which have been framed in times of past necessity, and which now, like ancient bandages, often cramp what once they strengthened,—with great and manifold difficulties in the way of any organic change, it must be mainly by the increase of our instruments of service that we obtain the elasticity we need.

But of all our objects, I do not hesitate to avow that I think the greatest is the gaining by this personal intercourse the power of larger, more trustful, more loving co-operation one with another.

Amongst our present causes of weakness as witnesses for Christ, I am convinced that no one is greater than our lack of unity. It will be one of our special matters of discourse, whether any, and what, practical steps can be taken towards a greater reunion amongst those who name with humble reverence the name of Christ as their Saviour and their GOD. No subject can be more worthy of our thought; few more full of difficulties before any decision on it, sufficiently accurate to guide us in practice, can be reached. For all such questions of detail become entangled in well-nigh hopeless perplexity as they approach that which we shall, I hope, every one acknowledge as the master principle of all, that no concord, which is purchased by the sacrifice of truth, is or can be Christian unity. Many questions indeed as to which subtle wits may wrangle, at once solve themselves in the light of this great moral principle. Bearing it in mind, we cannot, of course, invite to common acts of Worship those who do not approach together the same Object of Worship, or who do not approach Him by the same path of Faith in the atonement and the intercession of the Lord Jesus, at once very God and very Man. But there are a multitude of questions lying beyond those thus easily resolved, which tend towards the same result. On these I will only say here,—may the God of Truth and Peace guide and rule our coming discussions.

But none of these difficulties ought to intervene to hinder or thwart our own brotherly co-operation, as Lay or Clerical members of the Church of England. That Church has most undoubtedly a tone as much her own, as is the language which our people speak,—with all its provincial variations, still their own mother tongue.

The Church of England is at once Catholic and Reformed: Catholic because she is Reformed; and Reformed that she may be Catholic. She is no ambiguous, shifty, middle term between surrounding extremes, needing, in order to maintain her own equilibrium, to vary the balance of her own thoughts, as one or another of those from whom she differs seems to approach nearer to Her; but holding her old position here in England, as the One True Holy Apostolic Church of Christ,—dwelt in by His Spirit, nurtured and fed by His Sacraments, guided by His Word; and so maintaining the primitive faith revealed to her in that Word, and handed down in Creeds and in Doxologies, embodied in Sacraments, and delivered by her to her people through a Ministry of her Lord's own appointment.

Of this body it would be hard to say which is the more characteristic mark;—her unflinching firmness as to the fundamentals of the Faith, or her large liberality as to all matters which are not fundamental. She knows and acknowledges the many-sidedness of truth. She shrinks, wherever it is possible, from shackling the free play of opinion with any overstrained straitness of dogmatic definition. She knows that many of the differences, which exist amongst Christians, are the inevitable result of the various constitution of the human mind; that the natural bias of one mind to Objective, and that of another to Subjective, views of the One Revelation, modifies their mode of expressing the common truth which they both draw from it. She recognises the fact, that it is by combining all aspects, and not by rigidly enforcing one, that the whole truth is best embodied and conveyed; that the white light of pure truth is the result of blending in their right proportion all the prismatic colours, not by giving predominance to one.

This, then, should be our temper in this Congress: most unflinching in maintaining truth; most brotherly in allowing others, within the prescribed limits of our Church, to hold it and to teach it as to them seems the truest way. It is only by maintaining, whole and unimpaired, each of these characteristics—an unswerving declaration of essential truth—a large and loving charity as to matters not fundamental,—that we can hold our ground as the Church of a great and free people.

Such a union of Truth and Love, of firmness in maintaining the Truth, and of brotherly forbearance and trust as to allowed differences, I hold it to be a special object of this Congress to maintain. The tendency of all to whom the truth is dear, and who mix little with others, is to identify their mode of stating truth with the truth itself, and so to become narrow and intolerant. We Clergymen are especially exposed to this danger; first, from its being our direct duty to teach the truth, and so, from our being tempted, to form the habit of laying down the law for others; and next, from the peculiar position of the Parochial Clergy in the Church of England,—from their isolation, their independent action within their own Parishes, and their being so often (if they are men of any strength of will) surrounded by a band of followers.

But though we are thus specially exposed to this temptation, you, my Brethren of the Laity, are by no means free from it. No persons, perhaps, are more tempted to dogmatism than Laymen, who, from not having had a regular Theological training, are to a great extent unacquainted with the niceties of Theology, considered as a Science; and who yet are earnest in maintaining what in their own happy experience they feel to be the truth. Against these temptations to narrowness, free intercourse with those who see a side of the common truth different from our own favourite view, is the chiefest Guard.

When we contemplate these men from afar in our own seclusion, there is little to awaken our charity towards them, and much to arouse our suspicions. They cannot hold this and that, our self-esteem whispers to us, unless they are secretly infected with the terrible errors of Rome or of Geneva. Our love of truth supplied the material for our evil judgment. Our zeal for right fires the train. But when we meet these same men,—when we find them loving with us our common Lord,—meekly receiving His word, acknowledging heartily common formularies of belief, and using devoutly the same forms of prayer and praise, we discover our error; and, without abandoning a particle of our zeal for truth, we pray God to pardon our past lack of charity.

This result seems to me perhaps the chiefest good of our Church Congresses,—the chiefest good for ourselves,—the chiefest for our Church, and for our Master's Truth: for the words of Christ are still true and living:—"By this shall all men know that ye are my Disciples, that ye have love one to another." Against carelessness, against vice, against irreligion, against unbelief, we might do everything, if we were but united. It is the want of union amongst ourselves, which, more than anything besides, shackles us and strengthens our foes. Disorganization within an army breaks its force more than all the power of the enemy.

I venture, then, to press upon all who attend this Gathering, that they strive earnestly to maintain such a temper throughout our discussions; that, whilst they state without reserve or compromise their own view of truth, they abstain carefully from any word which can be needlessly irritating to others, and listen calmly, even if they be unconvinced, to the statement of views opposite to their own. If this caution be not observed, we may return to our several homes with our tempers embittered and our prejudices increased. This caution also you will, I hope, allow me to offer;—that we endeavour as much as possible to prevent our discussions from fixing on small and unimportant points, at a time when such mighty interests are at stake, and such great efforts needed.

One other suggestion,—and I have done.

Beside the direct objects of such a Gathering as this, one incidental result, and that not slight or immaterial, will naturally follow from it, if only it is conducted in such a temper as I have ventured to urge you to maintain and to make manifest to all men. In an age like the present, of shaken and unsettled, far more than of atheistic opinions, the mere exhibition by a large number of men of strong and educated intellects, assembling to discuss in public with full conviction such subjects as those propounded now to us, has a most wholesome tendency. It may show to wavering and distracted minds, that the earnest and undoubting believers in the truth of God, are neither few in number nor impotent in reason; that the enemies of revelation, exaggerated as their number seems by the restlessness of their movement and the repetition of their cries, are yet indeed few compared with the great host of the Faithful, augmented as they are in number by the fiery squadrons who fill unseen the mountain's side with their protecting presence. Such a proclaiming of fidelity, if it be accompanied with brotherly charity and union, may be of eminent service at such a time as this. The philosophic analyser of the causes of the great French revolution has recorded, in words of which I take leave to remind you, his judgment of the lack of such demonstration before the outbreak of that burst of Godless anarchy and terror.

"The Church of France," says Mons. de Tocqueville,* "so prolific down to that period in great orators, when she feared herself deserted by all those who ought to have rallied by a common interest to her cause, became mute.

"As those who denied the truths of Christianity spoke aloud, and those who still believed held their peace,—the result was, that those who still preserved their ancient belief, fearing to be the only men who still remained faithful to it, and more afraid of isolation than of error, followed the crowd without partaking of its opinions. Thus, that which was still only the feeling of a portion of the nation appeared to be the opinion of all, and, from that very fact seemed irresistible even to those who had themselves given it this false appearance. The universal discredit into which every form of religious belief had fallen . . . stamped its character upon the whole of the French revolution;—nothing contributed more to give its features that terrible expression which they wore."

Our Gathering is a public protest against the lack of a firm, vigorous, united, reverential faith in the old truths of our Church amongst men such as have assembled here; who fear not to discuss openly what they believe undoubtingly. May all its discussions be so guided from on high, that they may wear the character approved by the sentence of the Almighty Judge,—"Then they that feared the Lord spake often one to another: and the Lord hearkened and heard, and a book of remembrance was written before Him for them that feared the Lord, and that thought upon His name. And they shall be mine, saith the Lord of hosts, in that day when I make up my jewels."

* * *

HOW BEST TO QUICKEN AND EXTEND THE FOREIGN MISSIONARY EFFORTS OF THE CHURCH.

The Rev. CHANCELLOR MASSINGBERD, Lincoln, read the following paper:—

I VENTURE to assume that the reason of my having been invited to open the discussion on this subject, is the part I have had about the formation of a "Board of Missions" through means of the Canterbury Convocation. I conclude therefore that it will be expected that I give some account of what has been proposed and adopted on this subject, and I have no doubt that such a plan will be deemed to be germane to the matter in hand.

The question of a Board of Missions has been more or less before Convocation for many years past. In the year 1859, the Upper House directed the appointment of a Committee of the Lower House to report on—

1. The expediency of placing Bishops at the head of Missions—
2. The mode of deciding on such expediency—

---

* Causes of French Revolution. Translated by Henry Reeve, p. 284.

3. The relations of such Bishops to the Mother Church.

This was followed by the appointment of a Joint Committee of both Houses in 1861, whose report concluded with the following words:—

"I. That in our judgment, it is desirable that such a Board be appointed.

II. We would suggest for the consideration of the House, that it might consist of—

(1) Such Members of the Upper and Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury as the Convocation shall, from time to time, appoint,—

(2) Of Members of Convocation of the other Provinces of the United Church, should they think fit to appoint them,—

(3) Of such other Members, including the Secretaries of the great Missionary Societies of the Church, as they shall add by election to their number."

This was in 1861. But it was not until the present year that a definite plan was concluded, when two Reports of Committees of either House having been referred back to the Committee of the Lower House, they presented the Report which has now been finally adopted.

The Report was to the following effect:—

"I. That it is desirable that there should be some duly organised Board which should represent the Church of England in her Missionary aspect.

II. That such Board should not undertake the direct management of Missions, nor the collecting or receiving of funds; but that it should be a Body inviting communications from all parts of the world respecting the advancement of Missions and questions arising thereupon, on which advice and information may, from time to time, be required.

III. That the Archbishop and Bishops of this Province, and the Archbishop and Bishops of the Northern Province (if the Convocation of that Province should resolve upon the same course), be *ex officio* members of the Board; that the Convocation of Canterbury (and that of York, if it should so determine) should appoint annually a body of Presbyters, equal in number to the Episcopal members of the same, to be members of the aforesaid Board, and an equal number of Laymen being Communicants of the Church of England, and also admit into the Board such number as Convocation may hereafter determine, of Representatives (either Clerical or Lay) nominated by such Missionary Societies as shall signify their willingness to accept the invitation of Convocation to co-operate with the Board.

IV. They further recommend, that, if Convocation shall agree to the formation of a Board of Missions, a Committee of both Houses be appointed to settle other details of its constitution and modes of action."

This Report was adopted by the Lower House and sent up to the Bishops; and I believe I am correct in saying that it was agreed to by their Lordships.

This then is now the present state of this question. And it seems incumbent on me to show on what principle this plan has been founded, and what may seem likely to be the occasions on which such a Board may be advantageously employed. From which will follow some conclusions as to collateral advantages towards increasing the Missionary spirit at home, and imparting energy to Missionary work abroad.

It was a matter of great delicacy, and no inconsiderable difficulty, to decide whether such a Board should absolutely decline to receive any pecuniary help which might be placed at its disposal. Nothing more than this was ever contemplated. For it was felt that any such plan would incidentally affect the interests of existing Societies; and this was so strongly urged by one of those Societies, that it was finally decided to disclaim altogether the collection or reception of any funds. Of course it would have been quite different if the Church of England had been now for the first time organising a Missionary Institution; though even in that case there would not have been wanting some precedent for a separation of the two offices. For I have understood that the Roman Propaganda, though it exercises doubtless the greatest influence over the distribution of funds, does not actually collect or receive them; but leaves that office to a Society at Lyons by which the pecuniary affairs of the Roman Missions are administered. In our case, however, where we have several Missionary Societies at work, collecting and administering each its separate funds, it would have had the appearance of attempting to set up a rival Society, whereas all our efforts ought to be directed towards enlarging the usefulness, and, if possible, promoting the efficiency of existing Societies.

The next matter of importance, as regards the principle on which such a Board shall be constituted, concerns the appointment of its Members. And here, emanating as it does from the Synods of the Church, it seems natural that all the Bishops should be Members *ex officio*, to which, as now proposed, the Convocation of either Province should annually co-opt an equal number of Presbyters and an equal number of Laymen, being Communicants; and that Convocation should decide upon the number of Representatives of the Missionary Societies whom they shall associate with themselves.

As it still requires the assent of the Northern Province to all these details, and indeed to the whole measure, it is obvious that these matters are still susceptible of modification; and perhaps it may be thought, that the number of Members of the Board so constituted would be inconveniently large. But it should be considered, that no other provision is made for the admission of Members of the Irish Church, and that it will certainly be desirable that some should be admitted from thence, as well as from the Scottish Communion.

Such, then, being the proposed constitution of the Board, it remains to consider what its work will be.

It is described as "a Body inviting communications from all parts of the world respecting the advancement of Missions and questions arising thereupon, on which advice and information may, from time to time, be required."

Let us see what such questions may be.

The first proposal of such a plan as that which has now been elaborated by Convocation, arose out of the difficult questions connected with Missionary Bishoprics and Missionary Dioceses. I am not sure that such questions are as yet set at rest. And although it be acknowledged most fully that it is not advisable to hamper individual energy or check individual zeal by laying down rigid rules, the terms of the Report, which speaks of *inviting* communications, indicate that the Board would not interfere except when its counsel was asked for.

It is a question of much importance who shall decide on sending forth Missionary Bishops, who shall consecrate them when sent, and to what Metropolitan they shall owe allegiance.

Then, again, as regards the respective fields of Missionary work. It has been understood, that an application was made some years ago to the then Archbishop of Canterbury to define the limits between the Anglican and the Anglo-American Bishops in China, but that the Archbishop replied he had no power to do so. Other questions of a like kind may occur between our own Missionary Societies; and although, as has been said, the Board of Missions would not interfere except when invited to do so, it might be of great advantage that such a Board of Reference should exist. The questions relating to those who are now called "the Syrian Christians" in Malabar, are deeply interesting and important. And there is also a question of the highest consequence respecting Eurasian marriages. Where a man, who has contracted such an unhappy alliance, and who has brought up his children as Christians, the Mother remaining heathen, desires to become a Communicant,—is he to be repelled unless he will discard the unfortunate companion of his life, who has been faithful to him and become the Mother of his children? These are a few specimens of the sort of questions which might be expected to come before a Board of Missions, and the solution of which might be of great importance and advantage.

But another, and perhaps even the most important, matter might be an annual Report by way of *conspectus* of the state of Missions and Missionary work throughout the world. Something of the kind was proposed by Samuel Wesley, the father of the Wesleys, about the time of the foundation of the Gospel Propagation Society, and he offered to go himself to all parts of the world in order to report upon the likeliest places for the scene of Missionary enterprise. Surely, a Central Body at home, with communications throughout all those colonies and countries to which the enterprise of our countrymen or the development of Missionary zeal may have extended, would be able to concentrate an amount of wise counsel and experience upon Missionary work from which the best results might be anticipated.

I come now, lastly, to consider some collateral advantages of a Board of Missions, towards increasing the Missionary spirit at home, and imparting energy to Missionary work abroad.

We want, above all things, a Missionary Home in London, not so much for business, but as a place of which all Missionaries, of whatever Society within the Church, might be affiliated Members,—to which they might resort on their arrival in England,—and at which, perhaps, on certain terms, they might have rooms for a definite period. In connection with such an Institution, there might be Rooms for the Board of Missions, at which they should hold their meetings, and from whence any decisions they might arrive at, or any counsel they might give, would emanate.

If we would elevate the character of our Missions, we must seek to elevate the estimation in which our Missionaries are held. It is not right that those who have devoted themselves to Missionary work, should find themselves in a worse position, when worn out with labour, than sions of those who have been thus uninterested in the cause, are more than counterbalanced by the clear and decided testimony borne to the Church's work abroad by such men as the late Sir Herbert Edwardes, and the distinguished Governor of Bombay (Sir Bartle Frere), who is come among us to-day to give us the advantage of an experience of thirty-five years of active life in India.

We have to remember that Mission work consists, not so much in the extension of Religious Knowledge, and the formation of Visible Societies based upon religious principles, as in the winning of individual souls, one by one, to Christ; and that the extension of knowledge, and the formation of congregations must therefore proceed by slow degrees. Now this winning of souls depends, as we all admit, upon the shedding forth of the grace of God's Holy Spirit, which must be sought by the earnest prayer, not merely of those actually engaged in Mission work, but also, in at least an equal degree, of the Church at home. It may be said that many parts of our Common Prayer, as for instance the Lord's Prayer itself, certain verses of the *Benedictus*, the *Deus Misereatur* and the *Nunc Dimittis*, a few petitions in our Litany, the Collect for all Conditions of men, and especially a comprehensive prayer in the Holy Communion office, bear upon the subject of Missions, and are entreaties for their success. It is most true:—but we have to consider whether they are so applied when uttered in our churches; or whether they do not need some special application to give them this intention.

May it not then, with all submission, be suggested to our Fathers, the Bishops of our Church, that something may be done in this direction by their simultaneous action? They devoutly wish for the quickening and extension of the Missionary efforts of the Church, as they all assure us in the charges addressed to their respective Dioceses. But can they not do something more? When a time of war, or pestilence occurs, they issue for us a Form of Prayer, sometimes, with State sanction, for use in Church; most commonly however, as at present, for domestic and private use. How thankfully are such forms welcomed, and how extensively are they used! Can we doubt then, that, if they were to give us a selection of prayers for the revival and extension of Mission work, together with some directions for the application to the same subject of particular parts of the Public Prayer, their suggestions would be hailed with joy?

And yet more; it rests with the Bishops of our Church to represent Mission work as a more essential part of Christian duty, than it is at present considered in the English Church. The Bishops of the Church of Rome have long since urged this upon the Priests, and the Priests on their respective congregations; so that last year the sum acknowledged in the "Annals of the Propagation of the Faith" amounted to £231,006. The united income of our two great English Missionary Societies scarcely reaches a larger sum (£248,262). Of course the income of these Societies is far from representing all that is contributed by the Church of England to the Mission cause. But how much greater would be this income, if the English Episcopate with one accord would press upon the Congregations of the Church the duty of contributing to Mission work by a regular Offertory, or some other method. If the small Society of Wesleyans in England can devote every year to Mission work, from the alms of their poor congregations, no less a sum than £145,751, what might be the contribution of the English Church, if the Mission cause were regularly advocated in all the Parish Churches of our land?

But more than this may be done. Our Bishops are not alone, as a Senate of the Church, as they were, virtually, a few years ago; when their short Meetings on Ascension-day formed the only deliberative assembly of the Church of England. We have now, in the Revival of Convocation, a real Synod of each Province of the Church of England, not perhaps the best that could be devised (having been originally formed for a very limited purpose), but still competent to act, enjoying the confidence of the Church, and showing no unwillingness to be reformed in some particulars of its constitution. After many years of deliberation on the subject, the two Houses of the Convocation of Canterbury, have agreed, that in particular cases it is advantageous for the Church that Missions should be commenced under the direction of Missionary Bishops; and that there should be some duly organised Body to represent the Church of England in her Missionary aspect. On the first resolution, action has been already taken, and more than one Missionary Bishop is in the field. On the second, the two Houses, though agreed that there should be a central Board of Missions for the Church of England, and that Laymen should occupy a place at it jointly with the Clergy, are scarcely yet entirely of one mind as to its constitution and mode of action.

Much time may yet pass before the Board is constituted: it is therefore not too late to show how it may act as a means of quickening and extending Mission work. So long have we been accustomed, in England, to act through the valuable instrumentality of Societies, that it would certainly be a great evil if the Board should supersede the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel and the Church Missionary Society, though of course it would be most valuable in supplementing, assisting, and directing their work.

The former of these Societies has long been managed by a Standing Committee, consisting of the same elements as those proposed by the upper House of Convocation for the Church's Mission Board. It will, therefore, easily be able to work in harmony with such a Board, when once established. And surely the Church cannot afford lightly to put aside a faithful Handmaid, whose work and character were thus described by Mr. Gladstone in 1867:—

"Through this Society, the liberality and bounty of England have found and will find their way to the Colonies; and through this Society the highest authorities of the English Church, fairly representing at all times its united and corporate action, have lent the moral weight and assurance of their sanction to this great Missionary work. If ever there was a fair claim by prescription to be entrusted with the prosecution of this work, it is that of this Society, which, founded in days of growing coolness and gathering darkness, adhering to its work through every failure or discouragement, rising to its work with enlarged energies, and girding up its loins afresh at every call, has, at every epoch, been found sufficient for its noble work."

Scarcely less strong is the claim of the Church Missionary Society to continue her useful work, as described in a minute of hers, put forth so far back as 1837, which, even in those days, appeared to the rest of their Clerical Brethren. Yet it is obvious that, as matters now stand, a retired Missionary comes back after years of labour, with no claim upon any particular Bishop or Diocese at home, and is often required by the Society which he has served, to devote his brief intervals of rest and refreshment to the work of making known what he has done—(an office in itself ungrateful to delicate and sensitive minds). It is complained, that Missionaries seldom obtain preferment at home, and thus that there is a lack of encouragement to the Missionary life. Now, it is obvious to answer, that such a life implies that sort of self-devotion which forsakes all for Christ, and that they who have done so will find their own reward. Most true! and far be it from any of us to overlook that consideration. And yet all are not Henry Martyns, or Mackenzies or Feilds; and there is no reason why at least the meed of respectful affection and reverence should be withheld from such work as theirs; nor can it ever be supposed that their labours are appreciated as they deserve, if they fail to meet sometimes with some more substantial acknowledgment.

A Missionary Home would do something towards this. But there are other ways in which a Board of Missions, composed of influential persons, may be expected to help towards it. Such persons would know something of the work of the men whom they saw at such a place, and would learn to sympathise with their wants. It is not perhaps to be expected that Bishops should often feel at liberty to bestow preferment out of their own Dioceses, though there are not wanting admirable exceptions. But the preferment at the disposal of Bishops and other Ecclesiastical Patrons, is, relatively, so small, that one is tempted to ask whether it might not be arranged that, at least, some of what is called Crown Patronage might no longer be considered as a mere appanage of high offices of State, but might be assigned to such purposes as have here been indicated—not by being placed at the disposal of a Missionary Board, but that such a Board might sometimes be encouraged to recommend deserving cases to those having the disposal of such preferment. It has been said that even non-residentiary Stalls in some Cathedrals would be sometimes acceptable to Colonial Bishops; and in cases where Houses within the Close may fall to the disposal of the Chapter, it could not fail to elevate the character and the religious tone of such places, if they were occupied by retired Bishops or other Missionaries.

Another way by which to raise the standard of Missionary work, would be by extending very much the practice adopted with excellent effect in the case of some of the Zambesi, or now Zanzibar, Missionaries, by which zealous and devoted Men, being already Parochial Incumbents, were allowed to leave their Parishes for a time in the care of an efficient substitute, while they devoted themselves for a certain number of years to some particular Mission. In this way the tone of the Home Clergy would be elevated, as well as perhaps the character of the Missionaries. And above all, both by this means and by the former way described, a good deal would be done towards superseding that perhaps necessary evil of so many Deputations. There is something sometimes unreal about a Deputation; besides the hardship to the returned Missionary who is come to recruit his strength. But if we had, scattered about the country, a considerable number of men, who had either devoted themselves in the way last mentioned, or who, having gone out without prospects, had commended themselves after many years of labour to preferment at home; the spirit of self-sacrifice which they had cherished would infect their neighbours, while their experience would be invaluable in promoting Mission work throughout the Diocese where they were located, and so saving very much of the cost of Deputations, and cherishing an interest in their work.

But after all it must be remembered, that the chief ingredient in the promotion of Missionary work is the revived and increasing spirit of Love and Zeal within the Church itself. For this we must not cease to excite a spirit of Prayer, teaching all whom we can influence to believe, and act upon the belief, that they cannot help the work of Missions so effectually as by Prayer, and that no Parish, no Family, is duly imbued with Christian Love in which the Missionary spirit is not cherished.

The Rev. Dr. Francis Hessey, Vicar of St. Barnabas, Kensington, read the following paper:—

An inquiry, such as is proposed to-day, after the best means of quickening and extending the Missionary efforts of the Church, is of course to a certain extent a confession of weakness. But no other weakness is thus confessed, than that which attaches to all works dependent in some degree upon human agency. And indeed the supposed deficiency has, in this case, been greatly overrated. In some instances, for example, a false estimate has been formed of the success which ought to be expected. In others, the process by which Missionary operations are conducted, has been misunderstood. The information, on which men have formed their judgment, has been in many cases imperfect. And it has even happened that a Mission has been supposed to be abandoned, because its name has ceased to appear in Missionary Reports; whereas in fact its disappearance has been really accounted for by its having emerged from the state of a Church Mission into that of a regularly organised portion of the Church, and perhaps even a fruitful centre of fresh Mission work.

Another cause of frequent misunderstanding on this subject is to be found in the unfavourable tone of the Public Press in England; and perhaps in the unconsidered utterances even of Gentlemen who have returned home after a long residence in India. But the English public has now learned to estimate these at their proper value. Men have discovered, in the opinions of the Newspapers at home, the echo of those printed in our Colonies and Dependencies, in which, from a variety of causes, the Press has been for the most part hostile to the Church. And we venture to doubt the accuracy of impressions in regard to the Church abroad made upon Soldiers and Civilians, who notice nothing of the Church's work in the English Parishes in which they now reside. If, as is very often the case, such persons are far from being well informed as to the Church of England, and its work going on about them in their present English home, we can hardly think them likely to have been careful observers of the Mission work in and round the Foreign or Colonial Station, in which they have been formerly employed. And in the meantime, we judge that the unfavourable expres-

Church itself, and sources of Mission work. This is especially the case in the Colonies, where those to whom Missions have been sent are our own countrymen, and have needed rather raising from an accidental degradation, than elevating for the first time to the level of those who have organised Missions on their behalf. And it is most encouraging to see men now labouring in those Colonies as Bishops, who have been selected for their office, and presented for consecration by the united voice of Clergy and Laity, who have known and appreciated their labours in an humbler sphere.

But the step has been much more momentous, and has been taken with much more hesitation, which has converted fields of Mission work among men of foreign race and strange language into orderly portions of the Church, acting in concert with the Church established in these islands. Yet such a step has been already taken. For example, in the Yoruba mission, in Western Africa, there are at present five Native Clergymen and 2000 Native Christians, of whom nearly the half are Communicants, without a single European Missionary among them. In the Niger Mission, there is even an African Bishop, at the head of five Native Clergymen. And in the South of India, all seems ready for the appointment of a Native Indian Bishop over the very numerous native flocks served already by ordained Natives. The Bishop of Madras, in whose presence, and under whose correction, I now speak, has already his Indian Episcopal Commissary, for the visitation of the Native Pastors and superintendence of their work; and we may well hope that he has designed this measure as a preparation for the appointment in due time of a Native Suffragan Bishop.

The importance of this step will be seen immediately, if we consider at the same time the expediency of making Missions, as far as possible, self-supporting. For the maintenance of Native Pastors is far less costly than that of Europeans, and flocks will more willingly contribute to support men of their own race than strangers. And beyond this, there is a greater element of perpetuity in a Church, whose Clergy and Laity are of the same race, than in one dependent for its Teachers upon the Christian liberality of a far distant people.

We have some reason to fear that this step has been, in many cases, too long postponed: and that Native Christians have been much more dependent upon their Evangelists than they ought to be. It was otherwise in the old time. We find St. Paul gathering funds in newly-founded congregations for the relief of the temporal wants of Christians at Jerusalem, and not carrying out funds from Jerusalem for the maintenance of himself and of his converts.

Another means of quickening and extending Missionary efforts, has been found in the establishment of Church Councils in various Mission Stations, and Synods in various Colonial Dioceses, in which Clergy and Laity have been able to confer on many points of importance, and to organise work in such form as may suit the habits of the people among whom they labour.

Development is of course an important element in Church extension;—not development in doctrine (God forbid!—Sufficient for all time is the Faith once for all delivered to the Saints);—but development in discipline, in forms of worship, and in ceremonial usage. Our Prayer-Book is, perhaps, all that could be desired for an English-speaking population, accustomed to European habits; but we may have our doubts of its perfect suitability to Congregations which are not, like our own, restrained in their action by an Act of Uniformity. Valuable as that Act has been to us, we may well hesitate to place under its control those new portions of the Church of Christ, which it may be our privilege to see springing into existence wherever British influence extends.

It is a glorious thing to see already Pastors grouping their Church Councils round them, gathered themselves into Synods by their Bishops, and those Bishops assembled in turn round their Metropolitans in order to confer for the good of their respective portions of the flock of Christ! No danger need be apprehended from the gradual diminution of home influence. Such influence, where it is really beneficial, will be felt all the more, in proportion as those are left free, on whom it is exercised. There is no ground for anticipating that the various races less civilised at present than our own, among whom we have established branches of the Church, will necessarily run into error. They will have the same Holy Spirit among them as we have, and He is able to guide into all truth, and to keep in it, those who look to Him. And what if errors shall at some future day be developed, as in the Egyptian Churches of old? We do but see in these the repetition of Satan's work against the Church of Christ at a former day. "It must needs be that offences come," said our Lord Himself. And who are they by whom the offence cometh? Not, surely, they who act upon His command, and endeavour to make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things that He has commanded them; not, surely, they who, after the example of St. Paul and those whom he had commissioned, commit the things that they themselves have heard to faithful men, who may teach others also, ordaining elders in every city (2 Tim. ii. 2; Tit. i. 5).

St. Paul was aware, while he was extending the Episcopate together with the congregations of the Church, that perilous times were coming (1 Tim. iv. 1; 2 Tim. ii. 1); yet he did not hesitate to give freedom of action and development to the infant Church, knowing that it had the promise of the Holy Spirit's guidance. And so in like manner the Church in the present day must not shrink from fulfilling her Mission from any dread of the result. Men tell us of the Taeping delusion in China, of the Hau-hau superstition in New Zealand, and of the Brahmoism, or eclectic Deism, of Calcutta. These are but human systems, that have arisen from the corrupt passions of men, who have endeavoured to grace their errors by the adoption of a few fragments of Christian Morality or Christian Doctrine. The first and second of these errors are disappearing already; the third, which is the most formidable, holds its ground, rather by the mistaken sympathy of Christians, than by its own power. Young men in India have been trained by Christian Professors in the Science and Literature of Western Nations, but not in their Christianity. They have learnt to despise the superstitions of their Fathers, but they have been left to grope their way without assistance to something better. And what have they reached? A blank Deism, based, not, as they would have us believe, upon the ancient Indian religion, but upon the reasonings of Parker, Emerson, and Newman. We have heard it said of the Baboo Keshub Chunder Sen, who has lately visited our Island, that his professed adherents are counted anticipate the revival of Convocation, and the direction of its attention to the organization of Mission work.

"Missionary operations, as conducted by the Church Missionary Society, though apparently anomalous in the system of the Church of England, are yet in strict conformity with its constitution and principles. They are analogous to many other instances of voluntary exertion for the extension of true religion within the Church, in which Ecclesiastical authority and Lay co-operation unite for the accomplishment of the same end; so that these operations may be regarded as the acts of the Church of England, putting forth its energy for the Conversion of the Heathen world. The Bishops of the Church, under the authority of the law of the land, ordain and send forth our Missionaries: these Missionaries are licensed and superintended abroad, in every case where it is practicable, by Colonial Bishops of the Church of England; as are the other Clergymen of the Church officiating in the same Colony; and the services which the Missionaries perform are in strict conformity with the Ritual and Discipline of the Church. *Nothing less than the sanction of a duly assembled Convocation* can more fully identify the acts of any Missionary Society within the Church of England with the Church. Without such sanction, all associations of Churchmen must stand in the same position. Still further:—not to notice the present abeyance of Convocations, it may be asserted that, even if the Church were to assemble in her Provincial Convocations, and to decree and to regulate Missionary operations, such proceedings could not essentially add to or alter those important particulars, which, under present circumstances, entitle the operations of the Church Missionary Society to be regarded as Missionary operations of the united Church of England and Ireland."

Those persons, who, no doubt with most conscientious intentions, desire to supersede the two Missionary Societies, have laid some stress on the experience of the American Episcopal Church, which long since established a Board of Missions, instead of leaving its Mission work to voluntary associations. The precedent is certainly of value, for there has been a harmony and completeness in the Missions undertaken by the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, which has sometimes contrasted favourably with our own Missionary work. But, at the same time, we are bound to notice that that Board has not been entirely successful, either in raising the necessary funds, or in uniting the Church in the support of its Mission work. Indeed, it has needed to be supplemented, not to say, has been opposed, by an American Church Missionary Society, which raises annually a larger sum than that which is devoted to work beyond the United States by the Board of Missions of the Protestant Episcopal Church. Much stress has been also laid upon the supposed unity and completeness of the Roman Catholic Missions, directed by the Roman College "de Propagandâ Fide." That College, however, does not undertake to collect money, but leaves that important work to various associations, such as those at Paris and at Lyons, for the Propagation of the Faith.

We do not urge these instances, as furnishing grounds for setting aside the proposed Board of English Church Missions, but simply for confining its actions within definite limits. Thus, for example, it certainly should not undertake the collecting of Funds. And in case it should receive any, it should disburse them, not through channels of its own, but through existing Societies, through the Synods of Colonial and Missionary Dioceses, or by the hands of their Bishops.

Unfettered by the care of money, it would be most valuable, as the means by which the Church in England might communicate with the Synods of Colonial and Missionary Dioceses, on points of Ecclesiastical Constitution, Ritual, and even Doctrine. It might also address itself, in a manner that no society could, to various bodies external to the Church in England. It might superintend and advise the formation of Missions into Dioceses, and the grouping of Dioceses into Provinces. It might advise Missionary Societies, on subjects referred by them to its decision, and even in some cases might, if necessary, arbitrate between them.

We may easily conceive that it might greatly revive and extend Mission work, by attracting into the field many persons, who, though not likely to offer their services to a Society, would gladly connect themselves with a Mission Board acting in behalf of the Church. These would be the men of private means, and independent social position, of whom many are at present found ready to accept small Benefices, or even laborious Cures; but of whom very few are at present candidates for Mission work. Such men, contented as they are in many instances to serve almost without stipend, would be valuable to the Church as Superintendents of new Missions, especially where it is expedient, as we hope will frequently be the case, to commence the work under a Missionary Bishop. Our fellow Churchmen, in the Colonies and Dependencies of Great Britain, would look with more respect upon a Clergyman living on his own means, and publicly delegated by the Church at home, than on one who is sent out and maintained by a Society.

Nor will the existence of such a Board of Missions be unfelt at our Universities. The Public recognition, on the part of the Church, of the work of Christian Missions, may lead many students, both at Oxford and Cambridge, to look forward to the Mission Field as the scene of their Ministerial labours. The newly-formed Keble College, and perhaps some other College to be established hereafter, on the same principles, at Cambridge, may become great Training Schools for Mission work. It is not impossible that we may hear of the foundation of Fellowships with the especial purpose of assisting the Church's Mission work: in the same manner as Travelling Fellowships were formerly established for the advancement of science, and for the encouragement in our own Country of studies, chiefly Medical, which had hitherto been more successfully prosecuted abroad.

More than once already have the holders of Fellowships in some of the ancient Colleges requested permission of their respective Societies to take charge of a Colonial See, or a Missionary Professorship, without forfeiting their College endowment; and such instances are likely to be much more frequent, when the Church has given her formal sanction to Mission work, by the establishment of a Board of Missions.

All that has been yet suggested is an increased activity at home, which must eventually have its effect abroad, in quickening and extending labour on the Church's Mission Field. But on the Field itself there remains much to be done. It has been already suggested that many districts, formerly included in that Field, are now portions of the come the Societies to be jealous. On the contrary, it has ever been a cause of rejoicing to their best administrators, that work is done for the Church, for which they would perhaps have been unable to find the means and provide the men.

The false religions of the world are becoming every day more completely worn out, and their professors more anxious to discover a higher Truth than they have yet been able to reach. The speculative systems, that have been devised to present such a Truth to man, are being daily weighed and found wanting. Christianity, therefore, which has stood the test of so many ages of alternate opposition and indifference, needs but to be presented in her proper form to the seeker after Truth, to become what she ought to be "A light to lighten the Heathen and at the same time the Glory of God's People."

The Rev. CANON FREMANTLE read the following paper :—

I HAVE been invited, at almost an hour's notice, to put in an appearance for Mr. Gordon Calthrop, whose absence no one can lament more deeply than I do myself. I must therefore ask the kind indulgence of the Meeting, while I endeavour to express a few hasty thoughts upon this most important subject. I ought, perhaps, to say that they are rather hastily expressed than hastily formed; for having been connected with the work of Church Missions, and particularly with the Church Missionary and Jews' Societies for nearly forty years, both at home and abroad, my opinions have been formed more from personal observation of the work, than from the study of systems and theories which are advocated by different Schools of thought in the Church. The subject before us is a very wide one, and I will confine my remarks to those points which seem to me to occupy the first place in quickening and extending the Foreign Missionary efforts of the Church.

I. The selection of the men :—

II. The system upon which the Mission should be worked :—

III. The creation of a Native Ministry.

I. It will probably be accepted by all here present, that there is no subject which should be regarded with more grave and solemn responsibility than the appointment of a Minister to a Parochial charge. But the difficulty and anxiety of it are to some extent relieved by the fact of our having at home our fixed organization, our common language, and our social privileges. But when we are called upon to send a Minister of Christ into heathen lands to proclaim for the first time the Gospel, or to take charge of an infant Church but lately gathered out from the midst of Idolaters, it assumes a different aspect altogether. It will be only repeating a trite remark, to say, that he must possess the qualifications of a Missionary; that he have piety, and zeal, and good health, and aptness to learn languages, and so forth. And these will, as a matter of course, be required by all who have the selection of Candidates for Missionary work. But if Missionary efforts are to be quickened and extended, we must, I think, go a step beyond this. We must have men who have a special call to Missionary work—

men, who have one idea as to the work they have to do. They must seek to win souls to Christ as their one first and all-absorbing object. Everything must yield to this. They must be Enthusiasts,—not filled with the enthusiasm of humanity (for that could make nothing but Philanthropists) ;—nor Ecclesiastical Enthusiasts, (for that would only make them High or Low Churchmen) ;—but they must be Enthusiasts in their burning zeal for souls,—constrained by the love of Christ to live, not unto themselves, but unto Him who died for them and rose again.

It appears to me, then, that we should endeavour to raise the standard of spiritual-mindedness as high as we possibly can, if we would follow the Apostolic example.

I do not say, that some qualifications are not absolutely necessary to be taken into consideration in the choice of a Missionary. But I say that, if a man possesses that special gift for the work which is implied in the formal appointment of the two first Missionaries, "As they ministered unto the Lord and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, Separate me Saul and Barnabas for the work to which I have called them," (and remember, that one of these was a good man and full of the Holy Ghost and of Faith, and the other, the great Apostle of the Gentiles,) we may be sure that all other things will be added unto him ; for it has been well said, that God either finds His Ministers fit, or makes them fit for the work He gives them to do. Humanly speaking, we should not have selected Henry Martyn as a man possessing all the qualifications of a Missionary ; but few, if any, men have in so brief a space left so deep and lasting evidences of their special call to a special work.

II. I will briefly notice the system upon which the Mission should be worked.

It is obvious that two courses or lines of action are open to the Church,—either to present at once, if possible, the full Church organisation, the Bishop and the Clergy with the stated Ordinances, or to adopt the plan which has been pursued by one of our great Societies abroad, and partially copied by the late Sir Robert Peel at home, namely, that of gathering together the units of Converts forming the Congregation, and in due time establishing the entire organisation of the Church.

Much may be said by the advocates of either side : and for my own part, I confess to having had, many years ago, an opinion as to the Church going forth everywhere in her fulness ; but I have been led to change my mind as to this point, in reference to the Heathen. I am disposed to think, that the sending forth the Seventy Disciples bears a strong analogy to the subject before us. Our Lord sent forth the Disciples, two and two, into every city and place whither He Himself would come ; and thus, by preaching the Gospel, and healing the sick, and casting out devils, they prepared the way for the Coming of the Lord Himself and His Apostles ; in other words, for the authoritative organisation of the Church.

This method implies that the Missionary, in the first instance, is to lead the converts to the right and spiritual appreciation of the truth as it is in Jesus ; and when this has been received, the order and administration and authority of a Divinely appointed Ministry will follow. This has been remarkably illustrated in the Missions in Western Africa, New Zealand, and Southern India ; in each of which we find, just in proportion as the converts have been brought out into the liberty of the by hundreds of thousands. So far from this being the case, they are, in Calcutta at least, contained in one not very large Chapel, and in all India perhaps they are not very numerous. There was a time when the Christian Church might have hoped well of Chunder Sen. But when he inscribed on the foundation stone of his Chapel his denial at once of the Lord Jesus and of the Word of God, declaring that no MAN should there be worshipped, and no BOOK received as the Word of God, these hopes were at an end. We still regard him as one of the many instruments employed for breaking down the superstitions of his country, but we cannot look upon him, as many do, as a builder up of the Church of the future. While, however, we refuse to acknowledge in him a friend to the Church, we do not look upon him as a very dangerous enemy. We cannot see in his system a greater peril to Christian truth than that which menaced it from the Gnosticism of the second, or the Arianism of the fourth Century. And we believe that He, who raised up an Athanasius to stand against an Arian world, can find defenders of His Church in the present day.

Nearly all the discouragements, which Christian Missions have had to suffer in recent times, appear to be the natural consequences of a false view of the Christian Sacraments. Some Missionaries have so undervalued Baptism, as to encourage men to emancipate themselves from their heathen religious usages, without assuming the yoke of Christ. They have never taught them to look forward to Baptism as a high privilege, and have thus practically led them to neglect it altogether. While they fancied themselves to be making converts, they were in fact making only unbelievers; and they have been at last compelled to acknowledge that the absence of religious restraint is, among an uncivilised people, more dangerous to morality than heathen superstition, which, if only by the low motive of fear, had kept in check some of the worst passions of man's corrupt nature.

Other Missionaries, having an equally low view of the Sacraments, have erred in another way,—in admitting men to Baptism, and even to the Lord's Supper, without sufficient proof that their understanding was enlightened, their conscience purified, and their heart really touched. How prejudicial to Christianity such carelessness has been, we have had ample means of observing during the last few years. A careful and judicious discipline is surely most essential in this respect, in all newly formed Christian Communities. Baptism should be administered to no Adults but those who have been trained to look upon it, not as a mark of difference, but a channel of spiritual grace; and no baptized persons should be admitted to the Holy Communion, who regard it merely as a pledge of Christian union, but those only who see in it their Saviour's appointed means for the strengthening and refreshing of their souls.

But in order to carry out this discipline completely, it is necessary that the Missionary and Colonial Dioceses should be much smaller than they are; that, by due preparation for the Apostolic Rite of Confirmation, each Missionary may be able to educate his people gradually, and to delay their appearance at the Lord's Table, till not only he, but their Bishop also, is satisfied of their fitness for the full privileges of the Church.

The multiplication of Missionary Bishops will also lead to a better superintendence of the Missionary Presbyters, and of their Catechists, who should in many cases be ordained to a permanent Diaconate. It should be possible for a Bishop to be personally acquainted with every one of his Clergy, and thus to prevent, as far as possible, that deterioration which too often takes place in the remote and rarely visited parts of a gigantic Diocese.

Few things are so important as the character of a Missionary for zeal, energy, and piety. "In a Christian country like our own," says an experienced Missionary (Rev. D. Hinderer), "the aggregate of true Christian conscientiousness will expose and treat with contempt a bad teacher or minister of the Gospel, and his evil influence is thereby constantly counteracted. This cannot however be expected in a newly gathered Christian community growing up in a heathen land. Hence Teachers of doubtful character, especially if employed in the beginning of a Mission, produce eventually a sad spiritual decay. Very similar in its action on the future Christian community is the character of the first converts. In my own experience I could point to more than two Christian flocks, the one as old as the other, but very different as to spiritual life. The secret of the difference has been simply this; that in the one case there existed in the first converts a decided conversion, and an avowal of high Christian principles, which were quite wanting in the other. The first converts are always more or less the key-notes of the future community, inasmuch as they infuse the breath of their own spiritual life into the Christian body that is to be."

On this subject, our Missionary Bishops are fully awake, and long to have their ministry made more efficient, by an increase of their number, and a consequent diminution of the extent of their Dioceses. And the Church at home is beginning to see the reasonableness of this desire. For men now understand what is the life, and how great are the labours, of a Colonial or Missionary Bishop, and appreciate the words of St. Paul, "If any man desire the office of a Bishop, he desires a *good work*." And if it be asked, how this change in public opinion has been brought about, it must be allowed that it has been by two means,—frequent Parochial Missionary Meetings, and extensive circulation of Missionary Periodicals. By these the Public have been kept informed of what is going on in the Mission Field, and the spirit of prayer has been stirred in the heart of many a reader, who might otherwise have been uninterested in the welfare of Christ's Church beyond the limits of his own Parish. Would that the number of such Periodicals were greater! Dissenting communities know their value, and have circulated many more than the Church of England is willing to support.

We must not however indulge in a querulous tone, in speaking of our Church in a Missionary point of view. There is no present lack of vitality in her Missions. Her Missionary Societies have at no time more faithfully discharged their duty to her; and we may therefore well hope that whatever means are adopted by her to regulate their work, will be found only to advance and extend their usefulness. It is true that there is a deficiency this year in the Funds of each Society. But sufficient causes for this deficiency have been alleged in either case: and there is yet another cause, which has not been sufficiently considered; and that is, the large amount of money that has been gathered throughout the country for particular Missions, in particular Dioceses, without passing through the hands of any Society. Of such collections it would ill bestarves all Missionary effort. Our Internal divisions are a great stumblingblock, to Christians as well as to unbelievers. This Obstacle is not to be removed by the mere preaching of charity; the charity must be practised, not in the usual form of saying, "Come to me, and I will receive you." It is often necessary to consider, whether something may not require to be abandoned by ourselves, if we would acquire the power to save those who need our help.

But there are many things which might be done in this way, without any latitudinarian abandonment of principle, which would greatly increase our power of aiding Missions. I would submit one or two practical suggestions with this view.

At present there is generally a vast waste of power owing to the limitation of advocacy for one or other of our great Societies. A man hears an excellent Missionary Sermon, and refrains from giving, because it winds up with an appeal on behalf of the Society to which he does not himself belong. But is it necessary so to limit advocacy or collection? Of course every Churchman should have his own particular Society—the action of which he understands and approves, and which he can recommend, and regarding which he should make it his special object to collect information and to interest his Parish or Social circle. But why should not Sermons, Visiting, and Exhortation be less for this or that Society than for Missions generally? and why should not Churchmen collect avowedly for all Church Societies? I can testify from personal observation that all have peculiar excellences, as practical Missionary bodies; and that all together, better than any individual Society, represent the Missionary spirit of the great national Church of which they are handmaids.

In some parts of the North I have found a very excellent custom, which seems capable of useful development. In each neighbourhood, instead of each Parish or Church acting independently in its appeals to its congregation for pecuniary aid, there is a common understanding, not only among the several Pastors of our own Church, but sometimes including the Pastors of other Religious bodies, that particular Sundays shall be selected, on which every congregation in that neighbourhood should be reminded of its duty to contribute for religious or charitable objects. One Sunday the subject is Missions; on another, Hospitals; on another, Schools; on another, Teaching societies; on another, Parochial charities, etc. I have been assured that Systematic and general appeals so made are responded to with greater readiness and liberality, than when the appeal is made in the ordinary desultory manner.

I need hardly dwell on the necessity for a reform in our present system and machinery for collecting for Missionary purposes. The occasional Sermons, the Deputations from Parent Societies, are all generally felt to be more or less forced and unreal, and to involve great waste of time, of attention, of energy, of charitable feeling, and of money.

It would not, I think, be difficult to devise a better system.

Let it be a primary object to connect the Church here in England, heartily, visibly, and really, with the Church abroad.

Let each Pastor or Layman engaged in the work, select the Society, or if possible, the particular Mission, in which it is his business to interest his flock or his neighbours.

Sometimes the selection may be made on principle, sometimes from accident of local or personal association. There are probably few Parishes where there is not some one who has been in India or the Colonies, or has relatives or friends there; and their letters and personal experience will give a vivid interest in the work of those who are employed to preach the Gospel in the neighbourhood where the Exile is living or has lived,—an interest, surpassing that of any printed Report about unknown persons and regions.

Not that such reports should be neglected. If a local interest can once be excited in the work of any particular Mission, the reports of the Society to which that Mission belongs will generally furnish ample materials for interesting a local Mission meeting far exceeding any that could be afforded by desultory Sermons and formal Deputations.

Even in the mechanical work of collecting the offerings of the congregation, there seems room for improvement on the present system.

The Offertory might be made the channel of collecting from regular contributors, so as to dispense with much writing and correspondence.

The following system is much used on the Continent. Regular collectors are appointed to collect from a fixed number of subscribers (say twelve) a small fixed sum (say one penny) each weekly. When more than twelve subscribers have been secured, one of them is selected to seek out twelve more, so that the area of collection is capable of great extension.

The name of the Society or Mission, for which the money is specially contributed, may be marked on the paper in which it is wrapped. Sometimes collections may thus be received for many Societies.

All is then remitted to the Diocesan, who has a special Secretary, a good accountant and man of business, who remits the sums so received to their several destinations; and by this means, I am assured, the outlay of a very few pounds in printing accounts, effects for a whole nation as much, in the way of collection, as is done here by the great and expensive apparatus of but too many of our Societies.

It is by individualizing the appeal—by making each congregation and each member of the Church feel a personal individual interest in the work and its results, that it seems most possible to quicken the Missionary efforts of the Church at large.

III. I need not dwell on the obstacles created by race-antagonism in all its varied forms; *e.g.*, mere vulgar dislike of strangers and foreigners, in various shades, from pardonable John Bull-ism up to the most violent race-prejudice;—educated dislike, showing itself in different measure meted out to English and White men as compared with other races, in law-making and administration;—pseudo-scientific dislike, felt by men who hold "that God did *not* make of one blood all mankind; that it is a scientific mistake and moral impossibility to attempt making Negroes into Christians."

This last form can hardly be met by the ordinary weapons of Christian Charity, or even by more intellectual light. But I often regret that good Churchmen should be so backward in grappling with scientific discussions of the kind: that they should act as if there were some inherent antagonism between Modern Science and Religion, and then fly from the field of discussion as if Biologists and Anthropologists were moral and intellectual Lepers. The inquiry is one of great scientific interest, and of no less religious importance; and in both points of view, much is lost by its being abandoned to men of a Sceptical Antichristian spirit. Why should not Churchmen deal with such questions as they have done with Historical and Astronomical inquiry? All truth is of God. Science and History are but two of many Angels which make known His will and His works to man. If, obeying sound Canons of inquiry and reasoning, we arrive at a truth in Science or History, we may be sure, from experience as well as from faith, that it will not be found in the end to conflict with the moral truths revealed in His word. On the other hand, though much is revealed to all men, as the sun shines alike on the just and the unjust, a full revelation of God's truth, an entrance into His kingdom of knowledge, is promised only to those who are converted and become as little children. Much may be learned by the proudest, the most sceptical, and most self-reliant of philosophers, but the fuller insight is reserved to those who, like Newton and Bacon and many more, have entered on inquiry in the teachable childlike spirit which is learned at the foot of the Cross.

IV. A fourth obstacle is the pride or bigotry which inspires too formal an adherence to the letter rather than the spirit of our Anglican Church formularies. In dealing with nations different in many of their habits and modes of thought from ourselves, we should be prepared for considerable divergence in form, as long as essentials of doctrine are preserved. What are forms, and what are essentials, I will not attempt to discuss. I will only state my conviction that few things have more retarded the progress of our Church Missions, as compared with those of other Communions, than the non-elasticity of our forms.

But among the characteristic features which I am sure are *not* forms, is our Episcopal Church Government. Into dogmatic teaching, on this as on other subjects, I would not

Gospel, they have sought and submitted to the rule and administration of the Church.

III. The creation of a Native Ministry.

The extension of Missionary efforts cannot be carried beyond a certain point by the existing machinery of the Church at home. It may please God to give us more zeal, and more men, and more money for Missionary work; but we cannot draw any inference from Scripture, or from the history of the Church, that it was or is the purpose of God to perpetuate the Ministry of one nation for all the Churches of other nations who, through their agency, have in the first instance been converted to Christ. We find no parallel to it in the progress of civilization in our Colonies, where the intelligent native finds his place in posts of influence; and why should we expect any other rule in matters of Church government?

We are in danger of being over-sensitive and scrupulous in our views as to the fitness of native Converts to become native Ministers. If only we have the evidence that the root of the matter is in them—that they have consistency of conduct, and are instructed in the kingdom of God—they are as fit to go forth and preach to their countrymen, as any of our newly appointed Deacons are to preach to Englishmen.

We must make up our minds, then, to see, in due course of time, Native and Independent Churches, with native Bishops and Pastors, just as much as in the early days, when the Churches of Pergamos and Thyatira and Galatia and Corinth had their own Angels, Pastors, and Teachers.

But I must not enlarge. I must apologise for having said so much in a dogmatic spirit, and only add my humble prayer, that, in a day when the field of the World is open to Missionary labour, our beloved Church may be found faithful to her Lord, in sending labourers into His harvest.

I have no fear about funds. If the Church will only rise to her privilege as a Missionary Church, and continue faithful to her principles, she will not lack the sympathy of her members. The hearts and hands of Englishmen, Christians and Churchmen, will be open to aid her work.

England acts upon Christian principles when great and pressing objects are presented to her; and never did England stand out more beautifully and blessedly than at the present moment, when she has raised £250,000 for the aid of the Sick and Wounded of the Belligerents upon the Continent of Europe.

May God give us the blessing He has promised, saying,—Happy are the people who have the Lord for their God!

ADDRESS.

Sir Bartle Frere, K.C.B., read the following address:—

The question requires that we should first consider,—What are the influences which deaden and palsy the Missionary spirit of the Church? What obstacles oppose the greater activity and wider extension of Missionary effort?

We shall find most of these adverse influences and obstacles resolve themselves into one form or another of the spirit which inspired the old question of Cain, "Am I my brother's keeper?"

It cannot be said to be indifference; it is an active principle, pervading much of our modern teaching,—commercial, political, moral, and religious. We are told, on every side, that we have no duty, no right, even if we wish it,—to concern ourselves about what our neighbour is doing or suffering. If he is living in sin or in ignorance,—if he is grinding the faces of the poor, or making merchandise of the necessities of the fatherless or the widow,—nay, even if he is causing the death of thousands by selling to them deadly poison, or by wholesale slaughter in war,—the voice of much of our modern philosophy repeats the old question of Cain, "Am I my brother's keeper?"

And the answer of the Church is, as of old, a warning in the words of Eternal Wisdom to Cain, "When thou tillest the ground it shall not henceforth yield unto thee her strength."

A higher philosophy than that of getting the greatest possible immediate gain teaches us that the truest economy of riches and strength and knowledge is so to diffuse them that none shall be so poor, so weak, or so ignorant, as in their turn to work injury to their neighbours; for that none are so far removed above their fellow-men as to be beyond the reach of being made to share their suffering or their sin. If we want examples, we shall find them in the history of every outbreak of scarlet or typhus fever, of cholera, or other epidemic, and in nearly all the Social scourges which sooner or later punish us as a nation for acting in the spirit of Cain,—the pauperism of England, as well as the Revolutionary spirit which threatens us in common with our neighbours.

But what are the special manifestations of this spirit of Cain which impede Missionary effort? And how are the obstacles to be removed or overcome? It is for the Pastor and Teacher to deal with the spirit itself, and to exorcise it out of the Church; the Layman's duty is simply to state the practical evil, and, if possible, to suggest a practical cure.

I. There is the Selfishness which says, "We have so much to do at home, we have no time or money or thought to spare for Missions to other people." How is this to be met?

The Preacher will dwell on the duty of obeying our Lord's last command to His Church on earth, and on the incompleteness of the Church till the fulness of the Gentiles shall be gathered in, as has been so eloquently argued by Dr. Kay; on the reflex benefit which the promotion of foreign Missions confers on the Home Church—illustrated by the fact that active foreign Missions have ever been one mark of a living and growing Church. I would suggest one more topic, which seems to me hardly to have received all the attention it deserves—and that is,—The identity of Missionary work at Home and Abroad. In many parts of the home field of labour we have to deal with heathenism which in essentials differs little from that of Asia or Africa; under different names there are the same idols, the same Fetishes. We do not, as in India, see the trader annually and visibly worshipping his account-books and money-bags; but in the abstract we see as much idolatry of worldly riches; and whether the Idol be called Mammon, or Plutus, or Luximee, the forgetfulness of the True God and the worship of a false one equally calls on the Soldier of the Cross to put on his armour; and the weapons to be used are much the same under whatever name or form the Demon of uncleanness, of violence or deceit may pass.

And not only do some men work to most advantage in the field of home labour, while others are more efficient in the wider and more distant fields of foreign Mission, but there are many men who at one time of their lives can do most service at home and at another time abroad; and we are not without recent instances of the great value which such training in foreign warfare may give to those who have in mature life to contend with the manifold forms of evil in our own over-crowded Country.

It is by thus connecting the home and foreign Missionary work of the Church, and making each in turn subserve the wants of the other, that Extension of the Church's Missionary work seems to me most possible.

II. The next most prominent obstacle to Missionary labour seems to arise from a want of Christian Charity, which results in a narrow Sectarian exclusiveness, which cramps and attempt to enter. I would only express the results of a Layman's observations and convictions,—that where the eye and the hand of an active Bishop are to be found, there only do the Missions of our Church flourish as they ought to do, and that the non-extension of the Indian Episcopate in the same manner and to the same degree in India as in some of our Colonies, is one main cause why the honour of Evangelizing India belongs so much more to other Communions than to our own National Church.

The Right Rev. the BISHOP OF MADRAS read the following:—

AT the conference on Missions which was held at Liverpool in 1860, one of the topics for discussion was "*the best means of exciting and maintaining a Missionary Spirit*"—a subject resembling in part the one which is before us to-day. Several good suggestions were made by the thirty-three speakers on that occasion; and a Minute embodying the views of the Conference was adopted. This Minute recommended the diffusion of clearer and fuller information regarding Missionary work—its disappointments as well as its successes; more frequent reference to that work in the pulpit; prayer-meetings more numerously attended and sustained with deeper interest; the establishment of a Periodical of a higher class which should treat of Christian Missions at large; the training of all Christian children to take an interest in the mission cause; the introduction into the Theological course at Colleges of the subject of Christian Missions in all their bearings. And at a subsequent sitting it was unanimously adopted that a Lectureship be instituted; that a fund be immediately raised to defray the expense of such Lectureship for five or seven years at £300 per annum; that the Lecturer deliver his lectures annually in one or more of the principal centres of population or of learning; and that a committee, composed of certain gentlemen named, be appointed to carry the project into execution.

It would be very interesting to know what practical result followed this expression of opinion and these resolutions. That the addresses delivered did not prove fruitless I feel sure, though their fruit may not have been what was anticipated. And I feel sure that our meeting together this day, and speaking one with another of the things which concern our Heavenly Master's Kingdom, will not be fruitless of good, even though with all our combined ingenuity and good wishes we may not be able to invent any improvement in the great Missionary Machinery which is one of the chief glories of our nation. Perhaps we may clear away some rust, or pour oil in where it is needed, or strike some loose nail and make it fast, or mend some disordered wheel.

Now as regards the terms in which our subject is set before us, I understand "quicken" to be used in its old, not in its modern sense; that what we have to consider is how to give life, or to add life, and fire to the existing Missionary efforts made by our Church; and how to extend them, that is, both to get more people to join in making efforts, and also to direct the efforts to many more heathen people, to new fields of labour. The extension, I think, will be a natural result of the quickening. If a hundred Christians, or a thousand Christians, now taking some interest in Missionary work, receive some new life, some fresh impetus in the work, have their motives greatly deepened, their convictions of its importance strengthened, their realizations of the fact that the eternal interests of multitudes depend on it intensified,—it cannot but be that they will strive, with greater or less success, both to interest others in the work and to carry the gospel to places where Christ has not yet been preached. The quickening will lead to the extending.

The quickening, whatever be the means used for promoting it, must be the work of the Holy Ghost. If it be not this,—if it be only the result of human eloquence, of human efforts, of human persuasion,—of what avail will it be? We want more of the Divine power which quickens. And pre-eminently the first means to be employed for the obtaining of this is Prayer. God Himself is waiting for our prayers. He willeth not that any should perish, and has sent His Son to save. His Son Jesus Christ has commissioned His Church to preach the Gospel to every creature; He is intent upon the salvation of men; is bounteous in sending His Holy Spirit; waiting for open hearts into which the gracious gift may be poured; watching for prayers and intercessions, to which He may respond by opening the windows of heaven and sending down heavenly showers of richest blessings. Besides, He has explicitly told us that we must pray to the Lord of the harvest that He would send forth labourers into the harvest.

First, then, I maintain that, to quicken Missionary efforts, every one who now takes an interest in Missions must have some definite plan of praying for them. It is not enough to bear generally in mind the duty of praying for Missions. It is far best to follow some definite plan, such as one of the following:—

(*a.*) Belong to some Prayer Union. I have for several years been a member of the Cambridge Union for Prayer; and every Saturday morning, wheresoever its members are, whether in England or Australia, in Africa or India, in America or China, we pray for our Church at home and for the extension of Christ's kingdom abroad. Oxford, too, has its Prayer Union. St. Augustine's College has one. The Bar and the Army have theirs. Some of my hearers could no doubt add to this list, as well as add their testimony to the value of such associations for prayer that the Lord would send down the promised gift of the Holy Spirit upon the Church and the World.

(*b.*) Parochial prayer meetings for this very important object ought to be fostered and multiplied. Some of the Clergy are no doubt doing their very best to keep up by this means a prayerful interest in the world-wide work of Christ. But is not the number lamentably few?

(*c.*) Christ's people should take care that the subject form part of their family prayers frequently,—(why not every day?) their children and servants being instructed at proper times, so as to offer those prayers with their understandings, and, by God's grace, with their hearts.

(*d.*) Especially all Missionary Committees should regard Prayer as a most—may I not say, the most—important purpose of their meeting together. A person who becomes a member of a Missionary Committee ought to be a man of prayer. The special business about which they meet may be only to count money or arrange for a meeting; but on the money or on the meeting everlasting consequences may depend, even as the widow's two mites led to a Divine saying which has lived for the guidance of Christ's people in their duty of giving, and will live to the end of time. Committees recognise this claim, and some carry out the duty resolutely: let all Missionary Committees do so; and let every member of such Committee hold himself bound to attend the meetings regularly, and to bring his heart to them, if for no other purpose, yet that he may join with his brethren for a Divine blessing on the glorious cause in whose interest they are working together.

(*e.*) As a Church possessing a Liturgy, we ought to have the subject of Missions more fully and prominently set forth in our public prayer and intercessions. It is but lightly touched in the Litany, that God would "bring into the way of truth all such as have erred and are deceived;" and that He would "have mercy upon all men" (if indeed these two petitions do both refer to the evangelizing of the heathen). It is more definitely expressed in the prayer for all conditions of men (to be used whenever the Litany is not used), that "Thy way may be known upon earth, Thy saving health among all nations." But all who see and consider that two-thirds of the population of the world are still unbaptized, and that this is the nineteenth century since the Gospel began to be preached, will feel that the work of Evangelization now before us is far too vast and too momentous to be dealt with, in our solemn addresses to Almighty God, through His Son who lived and died to give salvation to the world, in terms so short, so general, so insufficient. There is a fuller prayer, as we all know; but that is only prescribed to be used once a year—the third collect for Good Friday. I look in other parts—the daily prayer for the Clergy and Congregations, the Ember week prayers—but I cannot find what I want. We do not pray to the Lord of the harvest that He would send forth labourers into his harvest, as He Himself bade us. We pray to Him to bless those who are already ordained, already labouring, and all Congregations committed to their charge: but we do not ask for more labourers; we do not ask for increase in the number or in the size of our Congregations. We pray that the minds of the Bishops may be so guided and governed that they may make choice of fit persons to serve in the sacred Ministry of the Church. We do not pray that the Lord would raise up a much larger number of fit persons, or that He would by His own Divine preparation make many fit. Ought not our Missionary Church of England now to possess some prayer, prescribed to be frequently (perhaps even daily) used, in which we shall desire that the Holy Spirit may be poured out upon all flesh, to give light and life; that the number of Ministers and Missionaries may be largely increased according to the need of them; and that the heathen may, in great numbers, become believers in the Lord Jesus Christ, and be baptized, and glorify Him, and be finally saved; or something like this? The late Bishop Cotton, of Calcutta, sanctioned the use of a Missionary Prayer in Divine worship, as one of the additional prayers before the General Thanksgiving; and it is used in many of our Churches in India. But some of the Clergy do not feel themselves at liberty to use it.

My conclusion is, that this Congress should show its deep sense of the importance of prayer, for quickening and extending our Missionary efforts, by taking steps for obtaining, however many difficulties may lie in the way, the introduction into our daily Service of a suitable Missionary Prayer.

II. I pass on now to another practical view of the subject. We are all very firmly persuaded that every member of our Church ought to take a hearty interest in the work of Christ, and therefore in our Christian Missions. But who are they whose duty it is to keep continually before the whole Church, of what spirit believers ought to be, and how they ought to glorify Christ? Unquestionably, the Clergy. Every Clergyman is, by profession, anxious for the extension of the Gospel of Christ; and it is a shame for such a one—a dereliction of duty—to regard with unconcern the work of Missions. If all the Clergy would do their duty in this respect, as some do, that is, would see that information on Missionary subjects is supplied to their people, to the several families, to individuals, to school-children; recommending Missionary Periodicals; talking of the subject as occasion offered; referring to it at times in the pulpit; holding monthly or quarterly meetings for imparting recent intelligence and for prayer; and at all times themselves showing an interest in the great subject; the result would be very far more creditable to our Church than it is. Not only would more money be contributed for the work, but more men and more women would offer themselves. It seems to me, then, that this Congress should try to discover some method of enlisting more especially the hearts and powers of the Clergy in this cause.

The Secretaries of the Societies could give valuable help in this. We know that Association or District Secretaries strive to secure the co-operation of every Clergyman. What are the replies those Clergymen send who refuse to co-operate? What excuses do they give? Some statistics on this head might be useful, if published: how many clergymen in a given district support a Missionary Society; how many do not; how many sent no reply to the request of the Association Secretary; how many sent a refusal without assigning a reason; how many assigned this reason, how many that. Let the public in each neighbourhood know the result. In due time the number of Clergy who took no active part in the work would be lessened.

We cannot force any man to take pleasure in promoting Missions. But the gentle pressure of public opinion often supplements the deficiency in a man's sense of duty. Where Bishops take note of the efforts made in their Dioceses for Missionary as for other work, there cannot fail to be some good result.

III. I only offer one more suggestion. Missionaries are expected to be self-denying men—to endure hardships. The belief that such *is* the case with our Missionaries exercises no small influence in awakening an interest in them and their work. The belief that such *is not* the case has checked or even banished such an interest. Now it is very important for the quickening and extending of our Missionary efforts, that this idea of Missionaries being self-denying men should be fostered; and that no pains should be spared to reproduce that representation of what the Missionary's life ought to be in the living specimens of it. It is an excellent thing for the edification of the Church generally, that Missionaries should be peculiarly self-denying men; losers in a worldly point of view by their choice of this work; examples to others of forsaking all or much for Christ's sake. Even men of the world look for this in a Missionary. Sometimes they demand what is very unreasonable; saying that a Missionary in India, for instance, ought to live in the heart of a native village, or clothe himself in coarse native garments, or mortify himself like a Sanyassee. Sometimes they find fault where no fault ought to be found, or make sweeping assertions about the luxurious habits of Missionaries, upon very scanty data. But they are right in looking for self-sacrifice. And is there not self-sacrifice? What if the houses of Missionaries are generally commodious? What if a Missionary be cooled by a punkah, under the burning heat of an Indian sun? What if he have as much food as he requires? What if he finds pleasure in his Master's work? Have Missionaries no special trials, from which their brethren at home are exempt? Oh, yes; both of body and mind. The burning sun is ever exhausting their frame. If sickness comes, many home comforts are wanting. Their children must be sent home, and separated from them for many years together. They have no promotion to look forward to, however efficient their services. Their labours, too, are as hard, and their trials in their work as great, as those of the more zealous among our Clergy at home.

And that Missionary life in India is indeed a sacrifice, is proved by the result. By it men's lives are shortened. Of all the South Indian Missionaries who have died since I went to India—*i.e.*, within the last nine years—only one (to the best of my belief) has died an old man, according to our English ideas of old. He was Mr. Baker, of Travancore. When Hawksworth, of Cottayam, died, he could have been little more than fifty. Peet, of Mavelicara, once strong, and ready for any work, however difficult, for mind or for muscle, died under seventy. Tucker, of Paneivilei, died under sixty. Noble, a temperate, active man, died, spent with Missionary and benevolent labours, at about the age of fifty. Thomas, a healthy, vigorous man, both in mind and body, after more than thirty years' labour, died, worn out, before he was sixty-five. Brotherton, always in good health till the last of his thirty-three years in the Mission field, was worn out when he was sixty.

Here, at least, is evidence of some self-sacrifice, some loss in this world for the Gospel's sake. And some, no doubt, of the Missionaries would undergo more losses than they do, would live more abstemiously, would adopt even the native plainness of dress and poverty of food, if it were likely that either the one would promote their influence and usefulness among the people, or the other their powers of withstanding the enervating influence of the climate, and of fulfilling the active Missionary duties which day by day devolve upon them.

I will not, I cannot, determine whether our Missionaries might make greater self-sacrifices than they do. Probably some might do so with advantage to the great and holy cause. But I maintain that not a few have sacrificed very much, have offered their very selves to the Lord, have not counted their lives dear so that they might finish their course with joy, and the ministry which they have received of the Lord.

These things ought to be known. The excellency of the Missionary life, as a self-denying life, ought to be maintained and frequently dwelt upon; that both Missionaries themselves, if they be forgetful to endure hardness, may be stirred up to aim more earnestly at spending and being spent in their Heavenly Master's service; and that the members of our Congregations may be duly impressed with a sense of the true nature and character of Missionary work; and (not last in importance) that young men of sterling worth, of fervent spirit—young men and young women whose hearts burn to make great sacrifices for Christ—may see in the true Mission life the very work to which they desire to devote all their powers and all their days, in the service of their Lord and Saviour,—the work, in the faithful fulfilling of which they desire to be found when they die.

DISCUSSION.

The Rev. the WARDEN OF ST. AUGUSTINE'S, Canterbury.

I LEFT my work at St. Augustine's yesterday in the assurance that I should be interested and encouraged—as I have already been most abundantly—by the words and the counsel of others. I came also in the hope that I might, perhaps, have an opportunity of being permitted to offer a practical suggestion in connection with the work in which it has been my happiness to have been engaged for more than twenty years at Canterbury. Our work there has been very much promoted and encouraged (for it is a work belonging not to ourselves only, but to the whole Church of England) by the formation, in most of the dioceses in this province and throughout the country, of bodies of laymen and clergymen for the purpose of looking out for, and maintaining in part during their college career, young men who may appear well qualified, as far as human knowledge can judge—so far, I mean, as human estimates can be made of them—for the important work of the service of the Church in foreign parts. And who are the men that shall be selected to go? That of course is a fundamental and important question, on which much might be said. But after the papers that have been read to you—after that most touching address of Canon Fremantle's—I will not add anything to the qualifications which he, with his long experience of forty years, has presented to you; for the views which he has expressed coincide entirely with my own. I will say no more on that head, except to give you an instance of the way in which this system has worked for the finding out of men, who have afterwards turned out to be valuable labourers in the foreign mission field.

After one of the early services in a cathedral, a young man, and a constant attendant, accosted the Minor Canon who had been conducting the service, and said in a tone of thankfulness, "Sir, I have been for seven years past making it my prayer to God that He would be pleased to open the way for me to become a missionary of the Church, and now, through your instrumentality, if I am approved of, I think at last I see my way to this desire of my heart." That young man was a printer in the city. The clergyman was the secretary of the association, which had just been formed. The printer had received from him the rules which had been drawn up. That young man caught at the opportunity, and presented himself,—and where could he do so more appropriately than in the house of God? He was accepted, and came to St. Augustine's. His bodily health, which was tolerable when he came to us, was at the close of the three years robust; and the sequel of his life has been such as entirely to fulfil the expectations with which we received him. Now I have said that in most of the dioceses of England there is an organization for the purposes I have named. There is, however, one exception. As far as I am aware, there is not in the diocese of Winchester any such organization for looking out for, and assisting in the training of, missionary students. I hope I am mistaken; but if I am not, then the diocese of Winchester is the solitary exception among our English dioceses in the whole province of Canterbury; and I am persuaded that this meeting will not separate without some of those present being willing to wipe away that reproach. It has been suggested to me that some of those laity and clergy, who are willing to hold a brief conference on this subject, will be so kind as to meet me to-morrow at five o'clock, after the afternoon session, for a brief conference on this subject in the reading-room below attached to this Congress-hall. A very brief time would suffice to put things in training for the establishment of an association; for the machinery is so simple, and the results have been so valuable, that I am persuaded very little more is needed than to put the facts of the case before those whose hearts are already willing to

PACIFIC

respond. The plan has been simply this: that a number of persons have promised to collect certain sums towards the small total that is required for the maintenance of a student at St. Augustine's, which does not cost more than £40 a year. I will conclude then, as it is now time, with just the application which I may be allowed to make of one of the proverbs of Solomon to missionary work (for assuredly to that it does apply most entirely): that "out of the heart are the issues of" missionary "life;" "keep," therefore, "thy heart with all diligence," and remember that "the preparations of the heart are from the Lord."

The Rev. G. W. Hills, Vicar of Curdridge.

I wish to say a few words on the subject of centralization of missionary effort in the Church of England. There are at least two great missionary societies which we have already;—one has been in existence about 170 years, and the second 70 years. Now these two societies have been doing their work, and have had a great amount of God's blessing. While they have been going on—one for 70 and the other for 160 or 170 years—the Church, as a body, has in a great measure ignored, and in some cases opposed, them; until, at length, some members of Convocation woke up, and said, "We should like to do your work." These two societies have been doing their work, and now others wish to come forward into the field, and take the work that they have been doing. I will just ask you—suppose the case of a brother clergyman, who has been working faithfully in his parish for many years: what would he think if another clergyman should come quietly into his parish, and say, "I should like to do your work—I will allow you to occupy the glebe house, and for the time take the emoluments, but let me do your work; let me take the preaching, the management of the schools, and so on"? Because, if this is not so—if Convocation does not pretend to do the work of the Church Missionary Society and the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, what is it to do at all? You say—exercise a sort of general superintendence. The committees of these societies are already composed of a number of excellent men, the laity, clergy, and fathers of the Church. So far the work being done by them is Church work, under the sanction of the fathers of the Church, supported by her ministers, and distinctly recognisable as an effort on the part of the Church of England to send the gospel to foreign lands. But here is the point that weighs on me. From the two existing societies we have certain pledges of what the character of their work will be. They are each pledged to their own characteristic features of Christian work. Every one knows the features of the Propagation Society as distinguished from the Church Missionary Society; and these distinctive features lead to the enlistment of the missionary zeal within the Church under one or the other of these great organizations, according to our individual estimate of the efficiency and suitableness of each society for the work designed. But what would be the character of a convocational body? We have no pledge from them what the character of their work would be. For my own part I think it would be better for us if we agreed more earnestly and more diligently to support the two great societies as they at present exist; and if I may be allowed to mention my own little experience, I think God has blessed us. This question could not come before a body of men more fitted and more properly able to deal with it than the clergy of the Church of England. And for this reason God has placed us as captains and colonels in the army of His Church, and it seems our duty as such to lead the main body—to lead those battalions which are more especially placed in connection with us. And I am sure, that if we ministers would only take a deeper interest in the propagation of the gospel ourselves, we can do more than we ever have done to further the interests of these two great societies, and to revive missionary work. I am sure that if we will only procure more missionary information ourselves—taking in the magazines, and studying the reports,—reading them attentively and prayerfully,—we shall, as I have felt myself, have our hearts stirred and warmed, and be thankful for what God is doing abroad. I have felt most vividly that the Spirit of God is with us as a Church, when I have read some of these reports on the propagation of the gospel in foreign lands. Then we can do a great deal by humble means. For instance, it was only last week that I received from a poor child in my parish, who has scarcely, I suppose, a penny piece to spare herself, a missionary box containing one pound and a farthing; and from young collectors in my parish I received sums amounting to upwards of £4: that, too, in a little parish of about 600 people. I have found a blessing upon God's work there; and I am sure, if we will get information ourselves, communicate it to our parishioners, promote collections by boxes, and more earnestly ask God to give us His blessing, we shall witness a revival of missionary work throughout the world.

The Right Rev. Bishop MacDougall, Archdeacon of Huntingdon.

My lord, ladies, and gentlemen,—I came here to listen, not to speak; but being called upon to say a few words in this great cause of missions, I felt that that very zeal for souls which made me first a missionary, would not allow me now to be silent. There is one part of the great world which has not been alluded to in the speeches of those who have preceded me, and one which is calling upon you, Christian brothers and sisters, to take it deeply into your consideration:—I mean the great East, where those four hundred millions in China are now being stirred up in a way they never were stirred. I am speaking of the inhabitants of China and the Eastern islands. Sir Bartle Frere well stated that many in India are coming out of "Egypt." I believe many in China are being driven out of "Egypt" now. There is at this moment the scourge of Mahometanism coming down upon them from the north, and there is the reactionary element of Tartarism and Mandarinism in the south and the middle parts of China. We see too the immense progress of Western ideas and Western thought that is working among the people now, but which is stirring up war against, not Frenchmen or Russians, but white men. They say the white man's religion is a religion that encourages human sacrifices, and they propagate this idea, to stir up the people against Christians. It is encouraged also, as it came under my observation, in a most extraordinary way. You know, our fellow Christians of the Romish Church have been working in China for many years—for 300 years; and they have had great success among the lower orders; for there are many—I should say more than a million—converts, and nearly in every province there is somewhere a Bishop. They have been teaching God's truth, it is true,—but God's truth with tares amongst the wheat. And it is shown in this one thing, the worship of the blessed Virgin, which has very lately been so exalted in that Church, and which is enlarged upon by their missionaries, as appealing to certain feelings in the minds of these Chinamen. They spread broadcast, as it were, pictures of the blessed Virgin and Child; and this very Child is considered as a proof that the Christians not only worship a woman, but sacrifice children to her. I have known friends of my own go to a picnic in one of their heathen temples, and be set upon by the people, because it was contended that they wanted to sacrifice Chinese children there to the Christian's God. That error, I say, is cropping up in this way now, and is thwarting the good the Roman missionaries have done. And this hostile movement now in China is not only against Frenchmen or Roman Catholics, but against all white men; and if our countrymen do not take notice of, and some action upon this, my fears and anxieties are great for the safety of every Englishman resident in China and in the islands. A general rising against Europeans may take place, like one in Borneo, in which I was mercifully spared when others fell, in an attempt made by Chinese to kill all white men there. I hope the rulers of this country will now take due notice of the recent sad massacre of our fellow Christians in China. Their blood is the blood of saints, and doubtless it will produce blessed fruits in God's good time. I believe it will. But now is the opportunity for this country to go in and take this cause up; and then for our Church to go in and build up Christ's Church in its purity in that land, where, I can tell you from my own experience, millions and millions are yearning for the knowledge of the truth. They are utterly discontented with the superstitions of their forefathers, and are asking, "What is truth?" I would, my Christian friends, stir up your zeal in this blessed cause by telling you of the blessed success God has given our Church in the East, in the few years we have been a missionary Church. The Roman Church has worked very hard there for 300 years. How long have we been labouring there? From the beginning of the century. True, the Propagation Society and the Christian Knowledge Society did all they could with very small means, in our colonies, and among the heathen around them in the last century; but we have only been acting as a missionary Church in the East since the beginning of the present century, when the Church Missionary Society joined in the good work, and stirred up others to a holy emulation in the missionary cause. Since then we have been working as a missionary Church; and God, it seems to me, has blessed our work in a marvellous way. When I look to the work of which my good brother, the Bishop of Madras, is at the head, and contemplate the fact that last year he ordained some forty native Christians as ministers of the Church in his field of labour, that assuredly is a success for which we may all be thankful. I wish he had told you something of his work, for I am sure he would have stirred up all your minds. I would say lastly to you, Christian brothers and sisters, that after living and labouring amongst the Indians and Chinese for twenty years, the conclusion I have come to is this: that there is an opportunity, such as there never was since the beginning of time, to gather these nations, the great mass of mankind, into Christ's fold; and if any one nation has the finger of Providence pointing to it to do this, it is England. The people there will listen to and trust and follow Englishmen in a way which they will not any one else. I can assert this as being the case, not only amongst the savager races, but amongst the more civilized people in China and the islands. They believe us, and trust our words; and it is for us to use the opportunity God has given us, to go forth and take advantage of it, to spread the knowledge of His name amongst them. I would thank the last speaker much for what he said with regard to the exertions of the clergy in this cause. I believe, reverend brothers, that if you would only interest yourselves in this matter in your own parishes, set up a missionary light there, get your information and communicate it to your people, you would stir up a deep interest among them, and deputations would be relieved from much of the tedious and trying work to which they are often put. We in our families should remember that when we say in the words of the Lord's prayer, "Thy kingdom come," if we use the words without doing something to hasten the coming of that kingdom, we are using idle words, praying in vain,—taking God's name in vain, as it were. For when we use these words, we pledge ourselves to do something to bring about the coming of God's kingdom, just as much so as when we pray, "Give us this day our daily bread," we give a pledge of our earnestness by going to work for the bread we pray for. If we were thoroughly alive to this duty, then I am sure our nation and our beloved Church would rise to their great mission; and God would bless us and give His increase in our prosperity more and more, as we make the ends of the earth to fear Him.

The Rev. W. H. Lucas, M.A., Vicar of Sopley.

I THINK we ought not to quit this subject of missions, without calling to mind that we are standing here on what is classic ground in relation to the missionary cause; for it was from the neighbourhood of the town of Southampton that perhaps the greatest missionary, since the days of the apostles, went forth to shed the light of the knowledge of God's gospel upon the great German race. It was from the abbey of Nursling that St. Boniface set forth on that glorious mission. Not many months since I was in the city of Munich, and there it did my heart good as an Englishman, and still more as a priest of the diocese of Winchester, to see that the grandest basilica in that city of palaces was raised to the glory of God, and in the name of St. Boniface. The Church of Bavaria, towards which all of us, who hope for, and pray for, the reunion of Christendom, are now looking with such special interest, has shown herself not unmindful of the debt she owes to the Apostle of Germany, and has gratefully dedicated to his memory a Temple worthy of the splendour of her chief city, and of the man whose name it bears. But although I felt proud that the noble Saxon missionary was so honoured by our brethren in Bavaria, I own my pride was somewhat damped by what the Warden of St Augustine's has just told us:—that we, who once sent forth a Boniface, have now no seminary for missionary education, and no organization within this diocese for the instruction of missionaries. I hope what we have heard to-day may kindle in us something like the zeal of that man whose name the whole Church venerates, and that we shall find many more Bonifaces to send forth from this our diocese of Winchester and this our neighbourhood of Southampton.

The Rev. J. R. Madan, Principal of the Mission House, Warminster.

Of the means for increasing missionary zeal which have been mentioned, I think that two more especially will be prominent in our minds. The first is, the institution of a Board of Missions by the House of Convocation; for I feel sure that St. Paul, when he left Antioch, and began his course towards the mountainous region of Asia Minor, must have experienced great joy and pleasure in feeling that the whole Church at Antioch had sent him forth, and that when he was surrounded by the robber-haunted mountains, the prayers of the whole Church accompanied him. It is not a question whether the two societies now in existence in England do their work well, but it is a question of the duty of the Church. The whole Church ought to send her missionaries, and not individual parts of it. I think, therefore, we cannot be sufficiently thankful that a Board has been appointed. The other point is, that the duty of sending missionaries ought to be put forward as a regular duty, and not as an occasional one. Our Lord often exhorted His disciples to feed the hungry and provide for those at home; but His very *last* words were not confined to themselves, for He told them to go forth into all nations and preach the gospel. Therefore to the Christian, one of the most regular parts of his duty ought to be the proper organization of missions. But I will leave this, and beg you for a moment to consider a point which has not been put so prominently forward,—I mean the training and finding out of men at home for missions. We have been accustomed, both for our own Church and foreign work, to choose men only from one class in society; and if there is one blot on the English Church, I think it must be that our clergy are drawn almost exclusively from the upper classes. I say I think it a shame, for these reasons:—Our Lord Himself did not choose as missionaries the ones who were titled—He did not choose them from the upper class only, but He drew most largely from fishermen and men employed in manual labour. Therefore if the English Church does not follow her Lord's example in this respect, she has somewhat to do before she can say she is perfect in her organization. And the second reason why I think it is a blot on the Church to draw only from one class is, that we ignore the call that God must give to numbers of men in the lower classes; and therefore she must deliberately check and discourage the willingness of young men of the lower class to give themselves up to the work. We ought as a Church to seek out young men who have a call to the ministry, and who desire mission work; we ought to provide for their education, and not leave them to themselves. How can you expect that a young man, who has been apprenticed by his father, and is now earning his daily bread, should like to throw himself again upon his father for a number of years, in order to train for the ministry? Ought not the English Church, as a whole, to offer free education to those of her members in the lower class, as we call them (I hate that word "*lower* class," as every Christian must,—but I suppose we must use it) ought she not to offer free education to them, if they state they believe they are called of God to work in the ministry, and desire with all their souls to give themselves to Christ? In Yorkshire, and in other parts of the kingdom, where we find the lower class coming so prominently forward that the government seems almost obliged to obey their beck, is there not a great deal to be said in favour of drawing young men out of that class? There must be a mass of zeal and energy amongst them, that only requires to be turned in the right direction that it may be used with the same degree of success as St. Paul used his zeal. Then I venture to press upon you, that this will be one of the chief ways to increase our missionary efforts, that we should search out the men who have been called to the work of the gospel, and that we should afford them free education, and thus bring out a mass of zeal, a mass of strength, and throw them forward into the outworks of the Church. Let us press forward with the work. Men are the one thing needful for missions. Books and such like may come in useful, but men must be sent. Our Lord's command was not "send the Bible"—not "send writings;" but "go ye forward." If we obey our Lord's words and expect the success He promises us, we must get men out from all classes, and send them forward to the outworks of the Church.

Archdeacon EMERY, Ely.

I SHOULD not have offered myself, at this late period of the session, to make any remarks on this subject, but for one or two rather cogent reasons. First, I wish to state, that it is very desirable, as a layman has expressed it to me, that all the speaking should not be left to the clergy. If a layman had sent in his name to speak, I should not have been troubling you at present. I hope, therefore, we may improve a little upon the practice of to-day, and have a succession of laymen as well as clergymen, to speak upon these important points.

In the next place, I wish to say one word on behalf of Convocation. We have no desire whatever to interfere with the various religious agencies for promoting and extending the gospel of Christ; but we look upon ourselves, even in our unreformed condition (and there is no one more anxious than myself to see Convocation reformed), as representing the corporate character of the Church. We are anxious, therefore, in the most modest way, to do our best, to give advice, and to assist in making as efficient as possible the noble missionary societies which now carry the message of truth to the heathen, and cause a blessing to rest upon our own land. Then, again, I wish to say a word on behalf of deputations. My early clerical life began as a deputation for the Propagation Society, whilst a fellow of my college; and I thank God that my dear friend, Archdeacon Hardwick, whom I have succeeded, induced me to go from village to village round the University of Cambridge, during my leisure hours, and say a few words, as far as I could—and they were very poor ones—in the encouragement of the holy cause.

And this I have found as the result of deputation work:—that it has done me a great deal of good,—and I hope it has done others some good also. But I am perfectly persuaded, from my own experience, that, if not the deputation, the meeting to which the deputation has been invited, has done a world of good to very many sleepy clergymen. And this I also have noticed, with respect to deputations, which it is now rather the habit to laugh at and speak against: that when a deputation makes a statement—a special statement of the result of missionary experience, which, indeed, he does not always know from actual practical experience, but reads, it may be, in what he believes to be, and in fact is sure to be, the true reports of those who are engaged in the various fields of labour—it is sometimes the habit of folk, who on the whole do not take much interest in missions, to laugh at such statement. But what strikes me as so very remarkable is this;—that when so eminent a man as Sir Bartle Frere is kind enough to write an essay—a most admirable essay—on missions, and when he puts forward therein exactly the same stories which we have given ourselves, the newspapers and the public, that have laughed at deputations, declare what he has written to be the most lively, the most exciting, and the most interesting statement ever made on the subject. I tested this a very short time ago in the University of Cambridge, as Ramsden Preacher, when I determined that I would try my hearers by giving them a missionary story. I watched the countenances of the university men, and I am bound to say that, when I gave a missionary story from Sir Bartle Frere's essay, I saw a laugh come over the countenances of some of them. Then, I say, do not you laugh at deputations. I believe their stories are true, because I believe that our missionaries are truthful men and godly men, and that the reports of our societies are true and not false reports. Rather, I would say, let those who complain of deputations read the reports. They do not do this as a rule. And when they do read them, let them pray over them. Also, when they talk about missionaries, let them not talk so much about the small results produced by them, but pray God by the Holy Ghost to give fresh power to those self-denying men, so that greater fruit may be produced by their labours. The Universities, however, are not wholly negligent on this matter, as some seem to have suggested; for, besides the annual sermon at Cambridge, we have other agencies and societies constantly trying to kindle and stir up a missionary spirit in the place.

We want our seniors, laymen as well as clergymen, to encourage us in this, and when they send their sons to the Universities, to teach them not to laugh at missionary efforts and deputations, but that it is the holiest and the noblest cause in which they themselves can be engaged; and that they should devote some of their spare time, not to frivolous pursuits, but to the promotion of this great object.

I think we have now a greater chance than ever of getting young men for the mission work. I look to the extension of middle class education, the raising up of our grammar schools to a state of greater efficiency, and the lifting up of the lower classes to greater intelligence, as so many means to this desirable end; especially if the Masters of our public schools—many of whom are clergymen—remember that they will best exercise the highest responsibilities of their profession by inducing a missionary spirit among their pupils. Once more: it has been said that when the young boys of the various schools show a desire for missionary work, we ought to give them a free education. In respect to this, a layman whom I wished to speak instead of myself,—Mr. Beresford Hope,—made a very true remark,—that if only the public will supply the funds, Islington, St. Augustine's, Warminster, and other like Colleges, will be very glad indeed to give a free education.

Therefore, to conclude, I say I am perfectly convinced that we need not be downhearted with respect to missionary effort. Christ's gospel is making progress. The world is being stirred up to renounce idolatry and to lay hold of the blessed tidings of the Lord Jesus. Do not let us be down-hearted—do not let us laugh; but let us exert ourselves by prayer, by exhorting one another, by looking in our various neighbourhoods for holy young men, and helping them by our means, as well as by our prayers, to devote themselves to the holy service of our Lord.

The Right Rev. the PRESIDENT.

I have received a letter from the Earl of Carnarvon, requesting me to state to this meeting that he is extremely sorry at not being able to attend. Business over which he has no control absolutely prevents his leaving London; otherwise he would have been in the midst of us.

The Session then closed with the Benediction, pronounced by the President.

TUESDAY EVENING, 11*th* *OCTOBER.*

The Right Rev. THE PRESIDENT took the Chair at Seven o'clock, and, after prayers, addressed the meeting as follows:—

Will you allow me to say, before I call on the Rev. Prebendary Humphry, that the subject for discussion this evening is just one of those subjects which must touch the deep inward feelings of each one who is earnest amongst us. It is one of those subjects, in discussing which we should specially guard ourselves from saying any word that can needlessly offend or grieve a brother, or from manifesting in any way a spirit unworthy of the great subject we are met to consider.

Let us be forbearing and loving, in brotherly love, with all our love of Christ's truth.

AGENCIES FOR THE KINDLING AND REVIVAL OF SPIRITUAL LIFE.

The Rev. W. G. HUMPHRY, B.D., Vicar of St. Martin-in-the-Fields, Westminster, read the following paper:—

HAVING undertaken to treat of "Agencies for the Kindling and Revival of Spiritual Life," with special reference to the Twelve Days' Mission of last year, it seems proper for me at the outset to explain, that I am not able to speak of the movement of last year from my own experience or observation of it; and I should hardly have felt myself justified in acceding to the request that I would open the subject, important and interesting as it is, had I not been sure that my deficiencies would be supplied in the course of the subsequent discussion.

I am not one of those who look despondingly on the religious condition and prospects of our time; and I desire not to say one word which may be inconsistent with the maintenance of a firm faith in the further advancement of Christian Grace and Truth. But the brightening day makes the shadows seem darker. The strongholds of evil appear more hateful, the more clearly they are discerned in the light of the Gospel. More and more we are grieved as we contemplate the irreligion, not to say the absolute heathenism, which prevails, or seems to prevail, in the densely crowded districts of our great cities. More and more we lament, I will not say the indifference to distinctive Christian teaching, but the inertness, the apathy, of many who make an open profession of religion. More and more we are pained, as we reflect on our own inner life, and discover how much is formal and unreal in our devotions before God, in the fair show which we know so well how to keep up before men. To the minds of the Clergy especially this darker aspect of human nature, as it presents itself around them and within them, is ever present. They know that upon them especially, though not exclusively, presses the responsibility for it. It is no wonder that some of them should have felt the responsibility a burden almost too heavy for them to bear, and should have resolved, at all hazards, with God's help, to make a fresh inroad into the realms of evil—to set on foot in their respective Parishes a new religious movement, in order to force home to the thoughts of all the consideration of the great things of eternity, to leave none unsought-for and unwarned, to startle the ungodly and profane, to dispel the illusions of the self-sufficient, to break through the reserve in which really religious persons are apt to shroud their feelings, to arouse all, themselves not excepted, to a more vivid sense of their Christian privileges and a more zealous performance of their Christian duties.

They who desire to have a Divine sanction for an extraordinary effort of this kind, may be referred to God's moral government of the world. Human nature, it is evident, does not, either in the community or in the individual, advance towards perfection with a constant progress; nor are the methods which God uses for its improvement uniform in their action. Sometimes, to awaken men from their false security, their selfishness, their love of this world, their insensibility to spiritual and eternal truths, He sends on the community His sore judgments, war, pestilence, famine, earthquakes, and the like. Sometimes He visits the individual with a sudden sorrow, a misfortune, a sickness, which reminds him that there is a God in heaven, and compels him to think of his own estrangement and backsliding from God. And though experience shows that such occasional excitements in too many cases pass away without leaving any permanent effect, and are often followed by a reaction and relapse which it is grievous to behold, yet these results are to be attributed to the stubbornness of human nature and the strength of old habits, and need not be regarded in any degree as a condemnation of the means which have been so ineffectually employed. From these general considerations it would seem to follow, that special and occasional efforts, such as that which we are now contemplating, deserve to be tried, although we must be on our guard against forming over-sanguine expectations of their success. In order that they may be really beneficial, great care needs to be taken that they shall not spend themselves in fostering merely spasmodic and transient effects, and that they shall not give rise to violent excesses and extravagances, such as those which are said to have marked the religious revivals in America and Ireland. A Mission should be so planned that, by God's blessing, it may leave consequences which will endure, and will also spread and propagate themselves, so that its quickening influence may be traceable in the Parish long after the occasion has passed away. For being in its very nature special and extraordinary, it cannot be frequently repeated. These necessary precautions seem not to have been overlooked by the originators of the Twelve Days' Mission. And when it is borne in mind that they were a small number of Clergymen, not directed or controlled in the matter by Episcopal authority, boldly trying a novel experiment, not in a corner of the country, but in the Metropolis, much credit is due to them on the whole for the manner in which the Mission was devised and conducted. Subject to great and necessary diversity in detail, according to the circumstances of different Parishes, the plan of the Mission, when most thoroughly organized, appears to have been as follows:—Preparations were made for several weeks, and even months, beforehand, by united prayer on the part of the Clergy and those of the Laity who were led to take an interest in the movement. A house-to-house visitation was set on foot, handbills were distributed, for the purpose of informing each individual of the coming solemnities, and awakening in him a desire to profit by them, or at least a curiosity to witness them. When the time arrived, a series of services was held in the Church on several successive days; besides the daily Morning and Evening Prayer, a special Mission Service was used of a penitential sort, consisting of collects and canticles taken from the Prayer Book, with appropriate Psalms and good popular Hymns. Frequent Celebrations of the Holy Communion were held. Extempore prayer was introduced. Stirring discourses were addressed to the people from the pulpit, from the altar rails, from the body of the Church. At the conclusion of the public Service, while the impressions produced by it were fresh, opportunity was given for those who were conscience-stricken, or otherwise burdened in spirit, to remain, and to have private conference with the Minister whose words had touched them; to open to him their sins, their griefs, their troubles; to seek his counsel and ghostly comfort. In a majority of cases the Parish Priest invited a stranger to conduct these special Services, and himself retired into the background, gladly profiting by the experience and zeal of one who was practised in such a work, and who, moreover, as a new comer, would be listened to with special attention. The Services and Conferences in the Church, were supplemented in various ways by meetings and classes held in schoolrooms and other buildings for prayer, for Bible instruction, for preparation of Communicants.

As to the real results of the Mission, or indeed of any work done for the good of souls, no one can presume to form an estimate. Those results may, in the sight of God, be far greater, or far less, than we imagine them to be. And as to the apparent effect, it may be somewhat premature for any one to speak, even if he has had the whole progress and sequel of the movement under his eyes. At any rate, nothing that I could say upon this point would be entitled to any consideration, if I had not had the benefit of hearing the substance of a Report on the whole subject, which has recently been prepared by a Committee of Clergy, and presented to the Bishop of London, and (I believe) other Bishops over whose Dioceses the Twelve Days' Mission extended. In that Report it was stated that the Mission had been worked, more or less completely, in about 100 Parishes or Parochial Districts of the Metropolis; and there was concurrent testimony on the part of the Clergy of those Parishes, given some six months after the Mission was held, that there had been among their people many signs of increased attention to the things spiritual. There had been a better attendance on the ordinances of the Church, especially on Holy Communion and the Week-day Services. The Communicants had been stirred up, Lay-helpers had come forward, many had been led to communicate with the Clergy as to their spiritual state. Many young persons attributed to the Mission the origin of serious impressions, which had been abiding, and had caused them, several months afterwards, to present themselves as candidates for Confirmation. Individual instances were adduced of striking and apparently permanent Conversions. But on the whole, from the statement in the Report, and from other trustworthy information, I have been led to the conclusion, that the most marked effects of the Mission were to be observed rather in what may be called the religious class, than in the irreligious masses, to reach whom was probably the primary object of the Mission.

In describing the chief features of the Mission, I have already said that they were by no means all combined in every case. A certain standard seems to have been proposed, which was followed closely by some of the Clergy, and with various degrees of divergency by others. In one place the work was conducted by the Parish Priest, not by a stranger; in another there was a succession of Preachers; in a third there was no departure from the Liturgy of the Church; in a fourth there was no invitation given for private Conference or Confession; in other cases, constituting about one tenth of the whole number, private Confession to the Minister was assiduously urged as an indispensable means of grace. Nor should I be giving a fair account of the matter, if I omitted all reference to Ceremonies of a questionable tendency, which, though confined to a very few Parishes, obtained considerable notoriety, and tended to cast discredit on the whole movement, in the minds of persons who were not accustomed or not disposed to discriminate. It is enough to refer to the use of Processions and Litanies, Banners, and Rites not authorized by our Reformed Church, such as the renewal of the Baptismal and Confirmation vows, the conferring of Absolution on Penitents in the Church. We have here an illustration of the truth with which we are all familiar: that a new religious movement, however good, is sure to suffer in repute, and to be thrown back for a time, by the injudicious acts of some of its more ardent supporters. The extravagances, however, which have just been noticed, were not really sufficient in the mind of the public at large to give an unfavourable complexion to the whole movement; and after making all allowance for the censure which they called forth, it seems to me that since the holding of the Twelve Days' Mission, which was chiefly promoted and most vigorously conducted by the Clergy of the so-called Ritualist school, the popular prejudice against that school has been in a measure softened; there has been a greater disposition to look kindly and respectfully on the Ritualist Clergy, and to give them credit for zeal and self-devotion. It will be understood that I say this, not as being myself one of their adherents, but as one who, while entertaining much respect for many of them, feels bound decidedly to differ from them as a body, on some important points of Doctrine and Ritual.

I believe myself that whatever may be the external attraction of a striking ceremonial, of liturgical novelties, and even of sensational preaching, the genuine success of a Missionary effort among our people will generally be independent of such excitements. "The less ceremonial the better," was an observation made to me by one who has had much experience of missions; and from several quarters I have had testimony given, that extraordinary gifts of preaching did not appear to be essential—that far greater seemed to be the efficacy of prayer.

If in the first instance the Mission was prejudiced, as perhaps it was, by its having the appearance of being a party movement, we may observe with satisfaction that it was able to "live down" and disarm such a prejudice. As a proof of this, it may be sufficient to mention that in one large district of the Metropolis, in which it might be expected that the Mission would not be viewed favourably, a meeting of the Clergy has been held, at which a general disposition was manifested to set on foot a similar effort as soon as arrangements can be made for the purpose.

The subject which I have now briefly brought to your notice is open to discussion on many sides, whether we consider its general principle or its details. There is one point which, as it seems to me, is of no little practical importance and difficulty, and to which I should wish to invite special attention. I mean the question,—By whom is the Mission to be conducted? It has been urged with much force that the conduct of the Mission from first to last should be in the hands of one person; that a single mind should be impressed upon it, so that the teaching may be systematic and consecutive, that there may be a method, an unity pervading the whole. The Mission Priest, it is said, in order that any deep effect may be produced, must throw himself thoroughly into the work, must concentrate his energies upon it, feel fully the peculiar responsibilities of it; and this he is not likely to do, if he is merely to take his turn in it with others. This opinion, which has been forced upon some of our brethren by the results of their own experience, is also strongly urged by a writer who has treated the subject of Revivals with acuteness as well as piety, though not from an English Churchman's point of view,—I mean Mr. Finney, of New York. He says "a succession of Ministers will not get into the spirit of the 'protracted meeting,' (the name which he gives to a series of preachings continued for many days)—and they will do more harm than good: just as if a different physician should be called in to a sick person every day." I have heard one Clergyman, well acquainted with both ways of working a Mission, go so far as to declare that he should for the future decline to take a part where there was to be a succession of different Preachers.

But further, while there undoubtedly are cases in which the Parish Priest single-handed has conducted the Mission with every appearance of success, it is held to be generally desirable that for such an occasion the services of a stranger should be enlisted. In many instances, the Minister of the Parish may be conscious that he has not the peculiar gifts required for stirring the Congregation, or dealing in private with the awakened consciences and the troubled spirits of individuals; or even if that is not the case, the people are too well accustomed to his voice, his manner, his doctrine, to be very much moved by anything he may have to say—they know, or think they know, all he can tell them. Times without number they have heard the good man make his solemn exhortations, his affectionate appeals—and yet they are what they are.

In truth, he has worked into a certain groove, a very good one it may be, and one of which he need not be ashamed; and he cannot get out of it. Let him go to a new place and he will be a new man, but he has ceased to be accounted as a Prophet where he is so well known. Or if that is not the case, he is regarded as a partisan of one school or another in the Church, and on that account what he says is received in some quarters with distrust. In short, his antecedents, however irreproachable, tend to damage the new character which he would assume, in endeavouring to speak—with the voice of one crying in the wilderness—"Prepare ye the way of the Lord,"—"Repent, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand." But the voice of a stranger has in its favour all the prestige of novelty. There is, there can be, no prejudice against him, but rather a disposition to meet him half way, as he has shown such zeal for God, and put himself to so much trouble for a Congregation with which he has no connexion or acquaintance.

Now if we take this view of the matter, (1) that a Mission, to be effectual, should be conducted by one person, and (2) that that person should be a stranger, we are led to a reconsideration of the whole movement, which may make some of us pause before we decide to join in it. A Parish Priest may not unreasonably think that he takes a somewhat hazardous step in introducing a brother Clergyman for so long a time as twelve days, or even a week, to stir up the slumbering flock by his eloquence in public, to influence them singly by his private counsels and persuasions, to probe their consciences, to give them the medicine which he thinks best for healing their wounds. The Minister of the Parish may fear that together with the good seed that is sown so zealously, some seed of evil may unwarily be dropped, which may bring forth its fruit by-and-by;—some point of doctrine, perhaps, unduly pressed, or too lightly passed over, or placed in a false light, may become a snare to his people, and a cause of future distress to himself. On such occasions the feelings are likely to be specially susceptible, and the mind more than usually receptive and retentive of instruction; and the evil as well as the good that springs from them may be expected to be more durable. At present also the persons who have experience in the conduct of Missions are few in number, and come chiefly from one side of the Church; and the Pastor may not be able to lay his hands on one who would be thoroughly like-minded with himself. Moreover, there is a financial view of the question which he cannot entirely shut out. He hesitates to ask for such a work the gratuitous services of a brother Clergyman, with whom he has no personal acquaintance, and who must put in abeyance his own regular work to come to him. The zeal and ability, the tension of the mind and spirits, the physical wear and tear, which are involved in the conduct of a Mission, deserve remuneration, even if they are freely offered. How is he to discharge the obligation?

To all this it may be replied, that allowing there are hazards and difficulties attendant upon this as upon every good endeavour, yet the evils of the present time are urgent; the indifference, the infidelity, the ignorance, the practical ungodliness, are crying aloud for some fresh outcome of Christian energy and zeal to contend with them. Here is an experiment which has been well tried, and, as it seems, signally blest. Why should we be faint-hearted? Let us only commit ourselves to the work with faith and prayer, and we shall be carried well through it, and we may be sure that God will make the good which results from it greatly to outweigh the evil.

For many of us, I doubt not this answer will be sufficient—yet it rather overrides than removes the objections which I have noticed. Still less does it remove the objections on the ground of principle, made by some even who might be expected to be well affected towards such a movement. There are those, for instance, who declare that they distrust the excitement and the unauthorized ceremonial which seem essential to a Mission. Others consider and say they are acting on the principle that a Church ought always to be in a state of Mission, always working at the highest pitch, breaking fresh ground, trying new methods for reclaiming the wanderers, and arousing the lukewarm and indifferent. Others think that under the existing circumstances of their own Parishes, the application of such a stimulus would be inappropriate.

Enough has now been said to give us all ground for rejoicing that the experiment of last year was made; enough to justify some of us, who watched the success of that experiment, in preparing to follow it at some future time. But good reason, I think, has also been shown why the movement should not be expected to become universal; and why there should be no reflection made upon any among us who may decline to enter upon it.

One word, before I conclude, as to the position which the Bishops may be expected to take with regard to this movement. It is not likely that they will all see fit to give to Missions precisely the same degree of sanction and superintendence. The varying circumstances of their respective Dioceses may prevent such uniformity. But as regards the Metropolitan District, the Bishops connected with it have, according to a recent announcement, agreed upon a course which I should think will be generally approved.

The Rev. R. Meux Benson, M.A., Cowley, read the following paper:—

The Church of God has need, from time to time, to kindle and revive the spiritual life of her children. That is assumed by the wording of the subject on which I am invited to speak. Mingling with the faithful are a multitude of the lapsed needing our ministry. We behold Christendom in a state of corruption and dissolution. This may surprise us. It was very evidently implied in our Lord's teaching respecting His future Church. Yet is it a weary sight. The natural heart becomes impatient of it, turns from it, denies Divine workings to be Divine if they are compassed with the infirmity of human development; begins with ideal speculation, and ends with practical disgust. What says the heart of faith? The greater the corruption which it sees, the greater is its estimate of that Divine Life by which it knows that that corruption can be staid. If it sickens whilst it surveys the world, it glows with new zeal whilst it gazes upon God. It realizes an organic unity of life still capable of being resuscitated into corporate energy, which must be set aside as a miserable unreality, if the life which the heart feels within itself were not capable of being communicated to brighten with the glow of Divine Light those portions of the Body which are getting dark and cold beneath the touch of spiritual Death. That life must be a circulating Life for the invigoration of all, if it is to be a real Life for the sustentation of the individual. The necessities which we see around teach us the power which we have within. In vain shall any look for the fires of Pentecost to hover again upon the outer air and rest upon a new Apostolate. It cannot be. The Holy Ghost has come down once for all to abide with us for ever. The Holy Ghost is in the Church. The Holy Ghost speaks by the Church. The Holy Ghost works through the Church. God would not be true to His covenant whereby He hath glorified the Body of His Incarnate Son, if the Holy Ghost could work upon the world by fitful influences, ignoring the organization of that mysterious Body which has been gathered out of the earth into the fellowship of heavenly Life. It is through man, taken into covenanted life, that the Holy Ghost works upon man for the purposes of that life. We must realize our responsibilities, if we are to rise to our privileges. We must communicate, i we are to possess. To say that the times we live in are not suited for such operations, is to say that God has changed. To say that we are too feeble to carry them on, is to deny that blessed utterance which shall ever ring on,—the abomination of an ungodly world, and the joy of the redeemed—"The Father is Almighty, the Son Almighty, and the Holy Ghost Almighty—and yet they are not three Almighties but One Almighty." It is in the responsibility of this covenanted Presence of the Almighty Spirit that the work of Missions is undertaken. The work of Missions within the area of Christendom, as well as outside of it, has to be undertaken by each faithful heart according to the measure of that Gift of Life, whereby it knows itself to have been gathered into the unity of God.

But it is said the ordinary Pastoral Ministry is sufficient. The Missionary organization is a disturbance of the settled order of things. No doubt if the whole Body of Christendom were in perfect spiritual health, the blessed influences of Pastoral love would be all-sufficient. But disease, ungodliness, unbelief, iniquity, are not the normal condition of the Body of Christ, nor of any part of it. What is provided, then, for the normal condition is plainly not to be supposed suitable for the extraordinary need. Yet, I say again, we are not to look for new Apostolates outside of the Church to accomplish the work of effectual revival. The Holy Ghost will work through those who have been separated unto Him; and why should there be any disturbance in the co-working of those, who have different ministrations entrusted to them, but by the same Spirit? Jealousies! As if the Minister of Christ, whether Pastor or Mission Priest, could dare to have any jealousy except for the glory of the Holy Ghost! As if he could have it without withering away from all efficiency in his own sphere by the mere fact of allowing himself to have it! Divisions! As if divisions could be developed by any coincident functions of the Spirit of Unity! As if the Holy Ghost, the more He works in any one, must not thereby make every one rise the more out of that which originates division into the oneness of His own All-controlling Energy! Disturbances! As if the Pastor and the Mission Priest had different ends in view, and were not auxiliaries to each other in the fight against the common foe! Disaffection! As if a people awakened by a Mission Priest could love their own Pastor the less, because they had come to love God the more! Contrariety!—As if the Mission Priest could be a Mission Priest unless he were *sent!* And who sends him? He is sent by those who, having pastoral jurisdiction in the place, invite him—the Pastor by active co-operation, the Bishop, at the very least, by tacit approval—invite him to assist for a special emergency. Woe be indeed to those who have no sending but their own zeal! A Mission is a regular exercise of Pastoral jurisdiction, invoking the assistance of an extraneous power for a temporary effort. We must always act, in any Parish to which we may go, simply as the representatives of the permanent local Pastors. To weaken the hands of the Pastor is to weaken the cause of Christ. Our one object is to call forth tokens of utility which in their permanent operation may have the permanent Pastor for their centre and guide. And so if Missions are charged with eccentricities, this is the safeguard. The Pastor is responsible. Eccentricities may either be good, or they may be bad. The progress of astronomical learning would not be improved by our determining that the planets should revolve in perfect circles. Eccentricities are bad, when they are indications of a principle of self-will at variance with outward circumstance and Divine rule. But there is no harm in doing an unusual thing, merely because it is not done every day. The Mission Priest will always see that he does nothing, but what is in harmony with the ordinary working of the Parish. It is more likely that he, coming with the large-hearted experience of intercourse with many Parishes and many Clergy, will remove the eccentricities of Divine worship, in a bad sense of the word, which are apt to proceed from the isolated independence of the Parochial Clergy, than that he should import any crotchet of his own, which must come to grief if the Parochial Clergy do not back it up; and, on the other hand, whatever be the specialty which distinguishes any Parish, if it be for good ,the Mission Priest will strive to infuse into this specialty, some high spiritual aim which may make it to be really for good, and not for evil. The Mission Priest must thus become all things to all men in the sense, not of courting popularity as against authority, but of co-operating with the local ministrations, so as to give them fresh dignity, life, and purpose. A Mission cannot violate unity, unless unity consist in the isolated existence of monads. Rather it is the exemplification of unity; for the Parish Priest who invites a Missioner, sets forth before his people the fact that there are others, widely differing from himself in the circumstances of life, who yet are one with him in its Divine realities; that he is not afraid of their co-operation, nor ashamed to seek help, because the fire with which he burns is the very same which enkindles them, so that the flame of his own Ministry, flickering, it may be, in its loneliness, will not be lost, but strengthened by coalescing with that of others.

Are we, then, to look for some special result from a Mission? We must; for there is the Promise of success "where two or three are gathered together in My Name;" and the Parish Priest who inaugurates a Mission claims this promise. Away, then, with all earthly feelings. All glory be given to the One, the Unifying, Spirit. Division of labour there must be, and separate spheres of allotted jurisdiction, which it were a sacrilege to violate, but it is Love that invites, it is Love that yields, co-operation. It is Love that originates a Mission,—Love for the souls which the individual Priest feels himself incapable of affecting as they need to be affected,—Love to those whose special work it is to carry out such auxiliary movements,—Love for that Spirit manifold in His workings, who provides all the resources of power in the Church to which the yearning Pastor can appeal in his necessity,—Love to that dear Lord, our Head, who has promised, that if we will act in union, He will go forth with our hosts.

But a Mission should not be the mere invitation of a Special Preacher by an isolated Parish Priest. Before a Mission is begun, the Pastor will be careful to gather together his faithful to join in exercises of devotion for the work which is about to be commenced. All the Communicants should be invited to take part in the Mission by special prayer and fasting. He may ask them on one or more preceding Sundays, to come to the Holy Eucharist with the special intention of seeking a Blessing upon the Mission. The Pastor will thus be able to say to the Missioner, that he has got together an amount of spiritual power, by which his labours shall be made effectual. What if there are but a few in the Parish who will join in doing this! Let those few be all the more instant with God in their pleadings for His Grace. A Mission, falls dead without such preparation. To neglect it would be a dishonour to the Blessed Spirit. If it is an extensive Mission, it would be well for all, or several at any rate, of the Clergy, Missioners, and Parochials to meet together for spiritual exercises to gather up the necessary strength. Many of us, doubtless, remember the happy day at St. Barnabas, Pimlico, when the Clergy assembled to ask a blessing upon the Twelve Days' Mission ere it commenced. People often lament the failure of Missions and other works too. But do they prepare them with prayers and fasting, as the Christians of Antioch did? Pauls and Barnabases are not given to a Church that will not prepare to receive them. The prayers and fastings of the faithful develope the saving power of the Priesthood, whether for Mission work or for subsequent edification. No use sending forth the ablest of men, unless you invite the Spirit of God to come with them. He with the Father and the Son together must be worshipped and glorified, not merely taken for granted. It is not enough to say, the Holy Ghost has gone forth with such men on former times. He must be invoked for each endeavour, as a Living Agent, exercising a Personal Will, to come into the field of battle with these His Servants.

So must the Mission be prepared; and throughout the Mission His Presence must be felt, the awe of His adorable Presence pervading every one and every thing. A Mission, that is not carried on in the fulness of the Spirit, cannot possibly accomplish the work of the Spirit.

And then, to whom is the Mission? It is to every one. It is a great mistake to suppose that a Mission addresses itself only to the bad, or to the poor, or to the ignorant. It appeals to all. He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the Churches.

The Parish Priest should therefore be consulted, as to the means of getting hold of the various classes of people in the most suitable times and manners.

There will be addresses in such large rooms in manufactories and schools as may be available for the purpose. Employers will frequently give their men an extra hour at mid-day twice or thrice in the Mission time in order that they may be addressed. But they must not be satisfied with that. If the mid-day address has done them any good, many will certainly be brought thereby to the Mission Sermon in the Evening. This is the grand Special Exercise of the Mission, at which all classes are gathered together. The Sermon must of course be of a more stirring character, than would be healthy in the ordinary teaching of the pulpit. All sorts of people will be present. Each must have something suited for him. The course of teaching must be continuous. Constant repetitions of what has been said in the previous sermons, so that people may realize, one and all, that they are learning something to be remembered, something to be loved, something to be done. A Mission is entirely spoiled unless this course is undertaken by one man, night after night. People must get familiar with him, must get to know him, must get to love him. There is a special love which a Mission Priest gets in a fortnight, which is something quite different from—though quite in harmony with—the love which the Parish Priest gets.

Then the people at the Sermon can be sifted afterwards, by having an instruction to follow it for such as like to stay. The Sermon must be as simple as possible,—but the class afterwards should be as conversational as possible. It is a great thing to get some of the people in Church to stand up, and ask one any question they will. Or the Parish Priest may stand up, and ask some question for them,—the Mission Priest is getting more and more near to their hearts. Their ears were open for the Sermon. Their hearts and understandings are getting open now. They feel that a Prophet has come among them. Remember, my dear brethren of the Priesthood, that you are Prophets. Do not some of them want to speak to him? When God speaks to us it always makes us want to speak to God. He must try, then, and get to speak with some of them. They must understand that when he is in the pulpit, he wants to speak to them,—but he is on the floor of the Church now, because he wants them to speak to him. And very likely many think they can venture to speak who never did speak in their lives to any Clergyman before. They begin to find out that the Clergyman can do something for *them.* They have got a difficulty. Let them stay behind and have it out. Many take an interest in the difficulty which has been started. Probably, if there are many Missioners, they may each of them have a little knot to talk to in different parts of the Church. Each one should be felt to be identified with the Priest who has preached, and with him who has given the class. It is a new revelation to a large number of people. They had thought that the Church was a place for the good. They wondered if they could ever become good. No. How could they? But now they find that the Church is a place for the bad too —the Communion of Saints, and the Remission of Sins. And then many will be brought to sorrow and Confession of sins not to be repented of. The Holy Ghost has convinced that soul of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment. The Mission Priest must not lose sight of it. He must do what he can at the time, and let his penitent feel that the Parochial Clergy are just the same as himself, working by the same Spirit. In the name of the Good Samaritan he hands the soul over to the Parish Priest to be cared for and perfected in holiness until Christ come to require him at his Pastor's hands.

Very often it will not be one of the ignorant, but some regular Churchgoer, who wakens up thus to a knowledge of Divine Life by means of the Sermon. There should, however, be special classes for them at other times of the day. The Holy Eucharist will, of course, be celebrated every day. At that there may be a short Eucharistic address, to lead the people to a more devout and intelligent attendance at the Blessed Sacrament.

It may be well to have a Sermon in the forenoon addressed to a higher class of persons alone, whose position allows of their coming out at that hour. This may be followed by a meditation, and it is a good thing for one of the Mission Priests to kneel down, and take up by way of extempore prayer and meditation the same points which have formed the subject of the Sermon.

During the Mission, too, the Sunday-School Teachers and the District Visitors should, if possible, be gathered together, even if only for a few times, that they may receive instruction as to their several duties and responsibilities. It gives them an interest in the Mission, and an interest in their work.

Nor should the Mission Priest shrink from going to the houses. A call from him may win back some one, who would never listen to the Parochial Clergy. He must indeed keep quite clear of any approach to entertainments. The people must feel that the Mission Clergy are in the place, town, or village, with a definite object which will not allow anything to be put in comparison with it. The most eloquent Mission Sermon conceivable loses its whole Mission power, if it is followed by a gathering in a drawing-room for general conversation. The whole population must feel that the Missioners are, at any rate for the time being, separated unto the Gospel of Christ.

The whole Parish will thus have felt the impulse of the Mission. There will be a Thanksgiving Service to close it; but it must be fully felt that the Mission is not ended, when the Missioners go away.

A vast amount of work has been got ready for the Parochial Clergy to carry on. If the place sinks back into inactivity, it will be worse than before. But Classes of various kinds will have been organized. It will be a joy to the Missioner to revisit the parish after some time, and witness how the Grace of God has grown.

The Rev. Emilius Bayley, B.D., St. John's, Paddington, read the following paper :—

There is one point in this thesis upon which, I think, we are all agreed, viz., the reality of spiritual life in the soul of man. But when we come to the question of the "Agencies" by means of which that life is to be kindled and revived, we find ourselves in a region in which diversity of opinion may and does exist. I would only observe, that divergence of opinion upon these and kindred topics is no proof that true spiritual life does not exist amongst us : thought, to be healthy, must be honest ; and if honest, it will be varying. Anything is better than the dead level of unquestioning agreement,—anything better than the harmony of unthinking indolence. Let us ventilate these questions, then, not in a spirit of controversial bitterness, but of brotherly love, making full allowance for the honest convictions of others, as we would ask them to make allowance for our own. Let it be our effort not to aim at a logical triumph, or some small gain in the tactics of party warfare, but to enlarge, if possible, our views of Christian truth, to hold fast that which is good, and to forsake whatever is proved to be erroneous and wrong.

It may be well, at the outset, to define and narrow as far as possible the point of discussion. There are two classes of persons who might be brought under consideration—(1) Those in whom the spiritual life is in full and healthy activity—(2) Those in whom it either does not exist at all, or in whom it has so dwindled away and died out, as to leave no perceptible evidence of its existence.

The terms of my subject lead me to believe that it was intended to refer specially to this latter class. How may the dry bones, which lie scattered up and down the valley of spiritual death, be made to stand upon their feet ? How may the dead be made to hear the voice of the Son of God, and hearing, to live ?

In the first place we must recognise to the full the Sovereignty of

God. "And he said unto me, Son of man, can these bones live? And I answered, O Lord God, thou knowest."

"It is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy."

The Sovereignty of God, wise, holy, merciful, righteous Sovereignty, is a fundamental truth; against it man rebelled at the outset, when, refusing to remain as tenant in the garden, he asserted his independence; and its recognition must accompany every case of true conversion.

Amongst other reasons, we must give due honour to this truth,—

(1) *As teaching humility*—as making us feel our absolute dependence upon Divine Grace—as convincing us that it is vain to plant, and idle to water, unless God give the increase.

(2) *As stimulating effort.* The fact that God bestows His grace in the exercise of a Wise and Holy Sovereignty, assures us that our labour is not in vain; that in using Divinely appointed means we are "workers together with" God; that we co-operate with Him in establishing a predestined and enduring kingdom. The Sovereignty of God, rightly understood, has no tendency to foster indolence, or paralyse exertion; it should rather encourage us to labour diligently by its assurance of the dignity of our calling, and the success of our work.

(3) *As checking impatience.* In the business of the spiritual, as in that of the worldly life, we are too prone to look for quick returns; and in an age of novelty we are tempted to leave the good "old paths" and seek results by means unknown to our fathers, and, it may be, unsanctioned by the Word of God. The thought that we are working under God should check the spirit of restlessness,—the spirit which prompts us to question our position or doubt the wisdom of means employed, only because we see not, to the extent we could wish, the work of our hands. We should remember that though agencies may be Divinely ordained, the agents, being human, are imperfect, and the fault, therefore, may lie with them. We should remember, too, that we labour in but one small portion of the vineyard; that we see but one little spot of a vast and comprehensive whole; and that we are, therefore, totally incapable of judging aright of the bearing of specific toil upon the progress of the kingdom, or of the visible effect which that toil is intended to produce.

Passing on, and coming closer to the kernel of our subject, we find the two-fold agency of THE SPIRIT and THE WORD made prominent in Scripture. The new-birth of the soul is from above, and that birth is of the Spirit—"That which is born of the Spirit is spirit:" yet not the Spirit without the Word, any more than the Word without the Spirit:—"Of His own will begat He us with the Word of truth:"—"Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the Word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever." If I do not dwell further upon these truths, it is not because I undervalue their importance, but because time presses, and because, I conceive, they have only to be stated to be fully recognised in an assembly like the present. What, then, are those agencies, those human agencies, which, in full recognition of the Sovereignty of Divine Grace, in reliance upon the Holy Spirit, and in the use of the Word of God, are effectual for the kindling and revival of spiritual life?

(1) *Spiritual Men.* Not Angels, but men. When Cornelius was admitted to the Christian Church, Angels were employed to bring Peter

and Cornelius together, but man brought his fellow-man to God. So in other well-known instances. Man, spiritual man, himself a partaker of the Divine life, and experimentally acquainted with the Gospel of Christ, is the agent by whom this work is carried on.

(2) *Spiritual men ordained and set apart for the Ministry of the Word and Sacraments.*

That the Christian Ministry is a Divine institution, and that it is one special function of that Ministry to "preach the Word," needs no proof in this assembly.

(3) *Spiritual men not specially set apart for the Ministry.*

I hold to the fullest extent the Divine appointment of the Christian Ministry, but not in such sense, or in any sense, as shall lessen the privileges or supersede the functions of the Christian Laity. The principle which lies, as I conceive, at the foundation of a Ministry, is the principle of order. God would have order in His Church, and with this end in view, as well as for the more extensive and systematic proclamation of His truth, He has ordained that men should be set apart for the due discharge of the functions of the Ministerial Office. But the fact that certain men are called to this office, and in the interests of order should commonly perform its duties, does not prove that others, not so called, may not perform some, at least, of the duties which specially belong to the Ministry. There were Lay Evangelists in Apostolic times, as when "they that were scattered abroad went everywhere preaching the Word;" there were Lay exhorters, as when the Apostle wrote, "Exhort one another daily;" and again, "Exhorting one another; and so much the more as ye see the day approaching."

Those of us who have had charge of large Town Parishes would be as ungenerous as we should be unjust, if we did not acknowledge the value of that assistance which we have received from Laymen. The Sunday School Teacher, the Scripture Reader, the City Missionary, the Bible Woman and her Superintendent, are agents, the success of whose labours will only be known hereafter. They sow the seed in detail which the Preacher can only scatter broadcast over the surface; their work may be less public, but I believe that its results are often as great as those produced by men whose fame is universal.

Nor let it be forgotten that there are agencies in operation in this country, which have no connection with the Church of England, but which have been for years, and still are, abundantly owned of God in the kindling and revival of spiritual life. Witness, for example, the labours of the Wesleyans, who, in an age of deep spiritual death, kindled anew the light of truth in many a dark spot throughout the land, and did a work for God which the Clergy had, to their shame, left undone. It is ungenerous; it lays us open to the charge of bigotry and narrow-mindedness, if we fail to acknowledge such agencies as these. Yea, more, I would advocate for the Church of England a policy, not of exclusion, but of comprehension: I would gladly see the leaders of opinion on all sides casting about for some common ground of brotherly union, not with the view of compromising principle, or of sacrificing conviction, but of ascertaining whether the links which bind us together are not stronger than we suppose, and whether some approach might not be made towards Christian fellowship, if not towards mutual co-operation. The agencies for kindling the spiritual life are many throughout this island; but they are the agencies of a disunited Christianity. And does not this tend to paralyse us? "Is Christ divided?" Is division of God? Nay. Then let us pray that it may cease; and, with forces united, a day of grace would dawn upon England such as our fondest hopes have never dared to anticipate.

But I turn to things as they are, and to such action as is carried on in our own Church. We have surely been making progress of late years. Missions, having the revival of spiritual life as their direct object, have been neither few nor unfruitful.

The Diocesan Home Mission in the Metropolis is an instance in point. Its object was twofold: (1) To send forth ordained men, specially adapted for the work, into the darkest and most neglected parts of London to preach in rooms, in courts, in alleys, in streets, in fact wherever they could gain a hearing; to do directly Missionary work in a Missionary spirit. (2) To hold Special Services as opportunity might offer. I confess I do not think that this latter part of the movement has been as successful as could be desired. Wherever Preachers of consequence were announced, a well-known Bishop, for example, large numbers would flock to hear him, many of the class one would wish to reach; but when the smaller race of Preachers took up their parable, the inevitable padding of the list, the audience would often consist of the habitual attendants, and the old men and women who saved their fire and candle at home, whilst they enjoyed the comfortable warmth of the Church and the mild excitement of a Special Service. But, whilst saying this, I believe it is difficult to estimate too highly the labours of those able and devoted men who have formed the Staff of the Mission. With the roughest material to work upon, they have, in many instances, formed large congregations, and have then proceeded to build Churches and establish in its completeness the Parochial system. This appears to me to be the truest way of dealing with our overgrown populations; it is a veritable going out into the streets and lanes of the city, and bringing in the outcast and the wanderer. But there is no time to be lost: the command is "Go out *quickly*." "The harvest truly is plenteous, but the labourers are few."

Of the Country Missions, inaugurated by your Lordship and others, I have had less experience; as also of the Twelve Days' Mission, carried on in London during the past winter. This much only would I venture to suggest: that for the success of these and kindred movements, three things are essential, over and above that highest bestowment, the bestowment of the Divine blessing.

(1) *Prepared soil.* That God has his own methods of preparing men's hearts for the reception of His truth, I fully allow; but this need not supersede other agencies. Attention does not involve conversion; but there will be no conversion where attention has not been awakened Hence, when any special effort is about to be made for the Evangelization of a Parish, a Town, a District, it is important to call attention to the movement, to explain its meaning, to invite attendance at the Services, to disarm opposition, and to secure sympathy. Let a serious, earnest, expectant spirit prevail amongst a people,—let much earnest prayer accompany the effort; and some success, at all events, must result from it. In actual warfare it is the object of the General to seek out

for attack some weak point in the enemy's line; but there are no weak points in the line of that Great Enemy with whom we have to deal; opposition will always be found; we may not be able to force the line, but we may turn the flank. We may, at all events, do much beforehand towards removing obstacles, and securing an unprejudiced hearing for our message.

(2) *Good seed.* Evangelistic preaching will not wander far from the two central truths of Repentance towards God and Faith in the Lord Jesus Christ: not the Law without the Gospel, but neither the Gospel without the Law. We cannot, indeed, have too much of the Gospel, but we may have too little of the Law. We must give to both their proper place and influence. We must not, however, confound the preaching of the Law with Legal preaching. Just as there is a Legal mode of preaching the Gospel, so is there an Evangelical mode of preaching the Law. Woe unto us if we preach not the Gospel; but woe if we preach not the Law also.

I would lay, therefore, great stress upon the full, clear, authoritative setting forth of God's holy Law, as binding upon all men and shutting them up to the necessity of a Gospel: I would lay equal stress upon the full, clear, exhibition of the free, complete, present salvation, which there is in Christ. There is room for much difference of opinion upon things indifferent: there is room for different modes of setting forth the same great truths: but the gold we offer to the people, if it be gold, is all coined in the same mint, and should all have the same ring in it. A stricken sinner, when he hears us, should have no doubt as to how he is to be saved. We must neither overstate nor understate our message; we must neither fetter it with conditions which do not belong to it, nor weaken the sanctions by which it is enforced: Christ the Crucified One must be placarded before men's eyes (Gal. iii. 1), so that whosoever will may behold the Lamb of God, and enter at once upon a state of acceptance and peace. But the Law must be also enforced as a rule of life and a touchstone of sincerity. Its obligation is immutable. We are bound as God's creatures to obey the Creator; we do not cease to be His creatures by becoming new creatures in Christ Jesus.

(3) *Efficient agents.* I assume the existence, in all who undertake this work, of deep spiritual piety, hearty devotion, single-hearted loyalty to the Lord Jesus Christ, and a burning zeal for the salvation of men. But the calling of an Evangelistic teacher, of one who would awaken the careless and impenitent and bring them to God, is one which requires special gifts. There must be—

(*a*) Deep knowledge of the human heart, and acquaintance with the workings of sin and the subterfuges of unbelief.

(*b*) Deep experimental acquaintance with Christ and His salvation, a clear apprehension of the Gospel scheme, and of its adaptation to the ever-shifting moods of the human mind.

(*c*) Ability to set forth with power and love the message of life.

(*d*) Ability to follow up the public preaching of the Word by wise, judicious, loving dealing with awakened sinners in private.

Where are men of this class to be found? The spirit and genius of our English Church has been rather Pastoral than Evangelistic; its aim, rather to tend and shepherd the flock already gathered, than to lay itself out for aggressive action. It is well that it is now recognising the necessity of Missionary action at home as well as abroad. Much of that action is confessedly tentative. We must be careful lest by acts of unwisdom we alienate more than we conciliate, we hinder rather than advance the cause of truth. We must not, I think, expect too much from exceptional efforts. Conversion is no light or easy matter. We cannot force the work of God. It is by enlistment rather than by conscription that His kingdom is recruited. I confess I look chiefly for success to the agency of wise, holy, zealous Pastors, supplemented in our large towns by sustained Missionary labour, and everywhere by the occasional assistance of men cast in the mould of a true Evangelist. Agencies of a more exceptional kind may have their use: I should be the last to decry them. Let every thing be tried. But I lean rather to the old ways; the good old Gospel, the old Parochial system, supplemented but not superseded—the faithful, laborious preaching of the Cross of Christ. What we require is not so much the discovery of new agencies, as the discovery of methods by which the old agencies may be made more effectual. Our hindrances, my reverend brethren, are from within rather than from without. There are many in all our Parishes yet living without God in the world. Let us ask whether our Sermons are likely to awaken them. It is not the religious essay, the amiable monologue containing in itself, as your Lordship once expressed it, the prophecy of its perpetual repetition, that will arouse the sleepers, or indeed, for that, keep the living ones awake. What is wanted is solid preaching, metallic weight as well as metallic lustre; vigour, plainness, boldness, full-bodied truth fervently and lovingly set forth: heart speaking to heart in language understanded of the people. Let each Minister of Christ but rise to his responsibility as one watching for souls, who must one day give account, and the Throne of Grace will be more frequented, the chamber of study, the house of God, aye, and the souls of his people will feel the influence: his Ministry will tell as it never told before; and instead of beholding around him the husks of neglected duty, the empty ears of a merely formal service, he shall see "first the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear;" yea, he shall look on the fields and see that they are "white already to harvest."

ADDRESSES.

H. F. Bowker, Esq., said:—

Ours is an age of longing desires and aching expectations. Thoughtful men are everywhere looking for the development of some great changes in Society. In one vast Country—foremost in all the luxuries and refinements of civilized life—Society seems in danger of dissolving into its original elements. If we who are assembled in this vast Hall believe that neither Art nor Science—refinement nor civilization—the loftiest faculties nor the richest cultivation of them, will satisfy such a mind as that which God has given to man,—what will?

The subject we are considering helps to answer the question. The possession of Spiritual life alone enables a man to use his influence rightly, to take his proper place in the Service of God, to become conscious of his responsibilities, and to use his great powers with benefit to mankind. It becomes a matter of great moment to us all, to ascertain what are the agencies which God makes use of to kindle and revive Spiritual Life:—of importance, lest in the busy occupation of such an age as ours, and in the midst of controversies which are rending the Church to its foundation, we should lose sight of some or any of the means for attaining the great object of the Church's existence.

It will not be denied by any of us, whatever difference of opinion may prevail among us respecting the *time* when Spiritual life is given, that it is the Spirit of God who alone can impart it.

"Of His own Will begat He us by the Word of Truth." "We are born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the Word of God." Nay, the Washing comes instrumentally by the Word—the Washing of Sanctification. "That He might sanctify and cleanse it through the washing of water, by the Word."

In those fresh days of fervent love to Christ which marked the first period of the Church's calling, the "Word" was its mainstay. "They opened the Scriptures." They searched them. They "preached the Word."

Our difficulties are increased by the very light which has been thrown on so many subjects. Men have dived into the depths beneath and scaled the heights above, and have applied the instruments of their observation so closely, that they think they have discovered contradictions between God's Word and God's Works; so that it seems to require in many minds more than ordinary simplicity of faith to grasp the Word with unwavering confidence. But is it all light that men so confidently talk of? Some of us know that there is a light which is only the mimicry of the light of Heaven, and that a light may be of such a character as only to blind its possessor. If it be conceded that the Spirit of God is the Great Agent, and the Word the instrument for kindling and reviving Spiritual Life, what are the minor agencies for effecting this great object? They are very numerous. Moses was in reality but a slave when called to his great office; David but a poor Shepherd; and the first preachers of the Gospel but fishermen. These were all robed, indeed, with power, but their power came not through any human call, but through the Spirit of God.

In later times, a Miner of Mansfield—a poor Innkeeper's son, of Gloucester—a Shoemaker, of Nottingham—have been used by God for the conversion of vast numbers of mankind.

But let me not be misunderstood. I am one of those who believe that an Ordained and Educated Ministry is the Ordinance of God. Did I not believe this, I would not stand before you this evening. I do not forget that Paul was the most cultivated in mind of all the Apostolic Band, and the most successful.

Neither do I doubt the right of the Church to summon such Agents as it may in its wisdom deem most suited to carry on its work. An Ordained Ministry is a first necessity,—to preach the Gospel, to administer the Ordinances of Christ, to feed His Flock, to build up the Church, and to extend its boundaries. But surely it was a part of our Lord's design to use other and supplemental Agencies, both for kindling and reviving Spiritual Life in the world. Parents are enjoined to preach Christ in their families; Masters and Mistresses to see that their servants know and believe the Gospel. The Schoolmaster teaches religious truth to his scholars. These, you will say, are more private services. Be it so. But the records of Scripture and the practice of the early Church tell us of more extended exertions. The first spontaneous effort to preach Christ was made by a woman. The woman of Sychar said to the men of her city,—"Come and see a Man who told me all that ever I did. Is not this the Christ?" It has never been proved that Apollos was ordained to the Ministry; and many of our critics think that we are indebted to him for that masterly exposition of the Gospel, so destructive of the assumptions of Rome, so annihilating to all mere Sacerdotalism—I mean, the Epistle to the Hebrews. Certainly, he was indebted for his first clear views of Christ to two private members of the Church; although before this his eloquence—his knowledge of the Scriptures—his fervency of spirit—had invested him with sufficient authority to teach diligently the things of the Lord (Acts xviii. 24–28). That this recognition and acceptance of what is called Lay Service in the preaching of the Gospel was general, the records of the Early Church abundantly prove.

My allotted limit of time will not permit me to go into the proofs of this from history. I challenge the examination of it, however,—nay, fearlessly. Amongst the Agencies for kindling and reviving Spiritual life, then, I claim the recognition as well as the undoubted right of Laymen to preach the Gospel to every creature. In doing this, I repudiate all mere excitement. I advocate no doctrines but such as were preached by Christ and His Apostles; no more, none less.

I would tolerate no style of preaching that is vulgar in diction or action—that is offensive to good taste, in tone or manner. I ask for no means or measures but such as experience has proved to be best calculated to reach the human heart. In these latter I include great earnestness of purpose and manner—earnestness which rebuffs the scoffing charge of the infidel: "You do not believe what you talk about: if I believed it, a fire would burn within me which would burst out on every occasion on which I met one who doubted what I preached." Bitter reproach! Who amongst us does not in some degree feel it? A winning grace of manner, too, and a warm sympathy will never fail to produce their right impression. To be "the Servant of all" is the duty of Christians under all circumstances; but especially is it so when preaching the Gospel. For when the deep fountains of the heart are broken up by the Spirit of God, then indeed, whatever be man's position here, the same helplessness, the same craving for sympathy is found alike in young and old, in high and low. In asking for the full recognition of the Laity as helpers of the ordained Ministry in evangelizing the masses (and surely, if ever, now you need their help), I am fully conscious of the difficulty of laying out plans of organization. We may not claim the stripes on our arm or the epaulettes on our shoulder, which denote an official position; we are content to be without them; but we do claim, as loving members of our Church, the privilege and the right, not only to fight its battles, but to enlist recruits into its ranks. If "the Spirit and the Bride say, Come," "let him that heareth say, Come."

In the present position of the Church—standing, as I conceive, in a narrow breathing space between the attacks of the past and the anticipated onslaughts of the future—it needs wisdom to devise, and energy to lay hold of, every means to keep and extend its influence as the Church of the Nation. Many are looking on with mingled feelings, indeed, but with intense interest at her present position. I respectfully call upon the Rulers of the Church. I call upon all its ordained servants to break down every barrier which prevents its expansion. No doctrine need be compromised, no truth imperilled, no vantage ground abandoned. To aid in accomplishing this, let all the talents which a bountiful Saviour has conferred upon His members be sought out, cultivated, and used for its extension. Let all jealousy of each other be set aside. Call upon the old, the middle-aged, and the young, upon men of every rank and station, the richly endowed in mental powers and cultivation, as well as upon those whose advantages have been but few—you need them all—to come to your help.

Pardon me if I avail myself of this great opportunity to urge this very earnestly and very warmly. My experience has not been small. In the course of the work which the Lord gave me for many years, I was privileged to help several young men to devote themselves to the service of Christ by entering the Ministry of our Church; but from our stiff regulations, and our discountenance of such Lay efforts as I am advocating, I saw many more young men of great ability go off to the ranks of Nonconformity; and this, in most cases, from the want of sympathy on the part of the Church with such efforts as they thought they were called upon to make.

Our neighbours across the Scottish border are wiser in this matter than we. Showers of spiritual good have been falling in different parts of that land for some years. A wave of blessing has, especially, been surging along the North-east Coast for a long time. I have more than once been a calm spectator of its results. A hater of all mere excitement, of all that is false or of tinsel in religion, as all who know me will testify, I bear witness to the blessing I refer to with calmness, but with joy. During a recent visit to a

Scotch Laird, I was invited to go to a fishing village on his estate. It contains about five hundred inhabitants. Far from the parish or any other Church, they had built a Chapel for themselves, and solely at their own cost. It will seat well nigh all the adult population. I was asked to address these people, mostly engaged in fishing, one Saturday evening, and again on Sunday evening, and on both occasions with the full approbation and encouragement of the Minister of the parish. Such fervency of devotion, such attentive hearing, I have rarely, if ever, witnessed. Truly the Spirit of God was there. Nor is that all. Their high moral tone is on a par with their spiritual attainments. They have voluntarily banished all intoxicating drinks from the place; and their integrity, love of order, and reverence for authority, are the observation of the neighbourhood. But what was the Agency for kindling so much spiritual life? The instrumentality of a humble layman, a mechanic, who spent his leisure time in preaching the Gospel from village to village, until, as in the instance I refer to, the moral wilderness has become a garden full of sweet odours to the Glory of Christ.

Time forbids me to speak of other agencies. I shall not be charged with forgetting that fitness for any Spiritual Agency is prayer and holiness of life. It has been well said, that to pray without being holy is hypocrisy,—to imagine one's-self holy without prayer, is delusion. "Be ye clean, that bear the vessels of the Lord;" "Lord, revive thy work;" will be the motto and the prayer of every one who puts in his hand to render help in the service of Christ. I have said that we need this help very greatly. I once went into a jeweller's shop to purchase a gem. The jeweller spread under it a coloured substance—it sparkled, and was beautiful. It had a native beauty of its own, but it took its hue from the material on which it lay. The religion of Christ is like that precious stone. The setting may be good or bad. If the time should ever come that we should set aside all our divisions, sink all our self-asserting claims to authority, then indeed, our Christianity will become like the diamond of the purest water, of which the setting is so arranged as to exhibit only the sparkling light of the gem itself.

We are fast nearing the great and awful Presence. In that Presence we must give an account of our privileges and responsibilities. Meantime let us remember that God is our friend, Satan our enemy, and Souls the Prize.

Who would not win many of these gems for the Crown of Christ? Who *will* win the most? The self-forgetting, the humble, the holy.

My prayer for you, my prayer for myself is, that these may be the marks of our high calling, and this the result of our work.

The Rev. Richard Twigg, Vicar of St. James's, Wednesbury, said:—

From what has already fallen from the lips of the previous readers, it must, I feel sure, be quite evident to all that the importance of the subject which is now engaging the attention of this Congress cannot be over-rated. It is a subject which deeply concerns us all. It is a subject which doubly concerns the ministers of God's Word and Sacraments, for they have to consider it both with reference to themselves and to the people whom God has committed to their charge. The subject before the Congress is, as you are aware, spiritual life, and the agencies by which it is kindled or revived in the souls of men. In the necessarily short space of time allowed for the delivery of these addresses, I can hope to do little more than state in a humble way what I believe spiritual life to be, and then name some of those agencies which the Holy Ghost—with all reverence I say it—seems most generally to use when He revives spiritual life in the souls of men. Spiritual life! it is a wondrous theme!—it is a subject I cannot hope to do justice to!—it is a subject as deeply interesting as it is solemn! With spiritual life the Church need fear no evil; without spiritual life, the candlestick of the Church must be removed. In the pages of Holy Writ, and in different parts of the Prayer-Book, the nature, marks, and characteristics of spiritual life are described to us. We there are told of the commencement, the growth, and the perfection of spiritual life. But if you look at the text of the programme, you will see that our attention is limited to the beginning of spiritual life in the soul. We are not dealing, as I understand, with the doctrines of perfection, but with first principles. I believe, then, that spiritual life is kindled first of all in the souls of men by the Holy Ghost in the Sacrament of Baptism. The Church distinctly declares that "children who are baptized, dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved;" and yet at the same time it is as distinctly declared, they "are born in sin, and are by nature the children of wrath even as others." If the baptized person fulfils his part of the Baptismal covenant, the spiritual life which is thus kindled in him will never die out. "All things belonging to the Spirit will live and grow in him." He becomes a living member of a living body which has a living Head; and there is nothing more for that soul to do to secure its everlasting salvation, but to use faithfully the different means of grace which God has provided in the Sacramental system of the Church. The great mission of the Church in the world is this: to educate living souls—not dead souls—to educate living souls for eternity. But spiritual life, like every other kind of life, must manifest itself. It will not do for a baptized person to say, "At such a time and place I was baptized; and although there are no signs of spiritual life in me now, spiritual life still exists in me." It is not my duty to prove that a baptized man is spiritually dead; he must prove to me that he is spiritually alive;—he must prove to me, in every action of his life, that he is a spiritual man. And what is a spiritual man? What is spiritual life as exemplified in a baptized soul? I do not hesitate to say, with the Bible and Prayer Book before me, that a spiritual man is a man who of his own free will has deliberately turned from sin to God through Jesus Christ our Lord. He is a man who has conscious acceptance with God; he is a man who is endeavouring to live a godly, righteous, and sober life: he is a man who, using all the different means of grace, is working out his own salvation—his own final salvation—with fear and trembling. But the fact is as notorious as it is sad, that great numbers of the baptized—I was going to say the majority of the baptized—do not fulfil their part of the Baptismal covenant. There are no signs of spiritual life in them; but, on the contrary, there are many signs in them of spiritual death. They do not observe those laws which God has given for the preservation of spiritual life. Well, what are the agencies which the Holy Ghost uses to revive in the hearts of such men spiritual life? They cannot be re-baptized. There is but "one Lord, one faith, and one baptism." I believe then, that the Holy Ghost—with reverence I speak His name—may give spiritual life without using any human instrumentality at all. I believe He has done so, and that He may do so; but it is not generally His way to do so. He generally uses agencies. He uses every kind of agency. He uses every kind of truth. He uses every event of life, for the purpose of working in such souls as these a desire for Spiritual life; but I need scarcely remind you that the Divinely-appointed means which the Holy Ghost is pledged to own, is the powerful preaching of the Word of God by a Spiritual man. In this preaching, as a previous reader has said, there must be the bold declaration of fundamental truths,—there must be close dealing with the conscience of the sinner,—with the conscience of the sinner, rather than with the feelings and emotions of the sinner;—there must be the plain unfolding of the plan of salvation; there must be offered a present, free, and full salvation—if the sinner will only surrender himself, just as he is, to Almighty God. The preacher must expect immediate results. He must not be satisfied with anything less than the unconditional surrender of the soul to Almighty God; he must not be satisfied with anything else than to see that soul prepared to receive all its loving Saviour has died to procure for it. Thus far I hope all of us are agreed. There may be little differences of opinion amongst us now, and yet I do not see why there should be the slightest difference of opinion. We will suppose, and it is supposing no impossibility—(thank God, such cases appear every week of our lives in the parishes of some of us)—we will suppose a man has listened to such preaching as this—we suppose he believes what the preacher has declared—we suppose that he realize his danger—we suppose he believes there is mercy for him—we suppose he believes that if he can but appropriate to himself the purchased righteousness of Christ it may be his. But sin has paralysed the powers of that soul—it is unable to appropriate what Christ has done for it. What is to be done with the soul in such a case as this? In this crisis of the soul's history it may be directed—is directed—in one or other of four ways: and every day of our lives souls are being thus directed. Some may tell the soul to go and wrestle it out with God in private. Some may tell the soul to go and speak to some godly man—clergyman or layman—about its state. Some will tell the soul to go to the penitent prayer-meeting; and some will tell the soul to go and unburden itself to a priest of God in sacramental confession. Which is the best of these ways? I suppose each one of us would say "This or that is the best way, because through it I found peace with God." A clergyman will say, "This is the best way, because I have been in this way the means of bringing many souls to the foot of Christ's cross." The soldier prizes the weapon the most which he can handle the best, and with which he can do most execution in the ranks of the enemy. I say myself, with much deference to the opinions of every one else, that the Holy Ghost uses all these agencies through which to revive spiritual life in the souls of the baptized. Can there be a doubt of it?

(1) Can there be a shadow of a doubt that the majority of our baptized Church people, the majority of our old-fashioned Church-goers, have found peace with God in this way? Can there be a doubt that numbers of our people now find peace with God in this way? Let me give an illustration of what I mean. Some years ago it was my duty to take part in a mission in Herefordshire; after the sermon the preacher invited all those who felt distressed about the state of their souls, to adjourn to the neighbouring schoolroom. I was directed to go and speak to different persons in this schoolroom. There was great distress of soul in many: there was quiet praying and a quiet seeking of the Lord in all. I reached at last one young man who was deeply moved. I spoke to him, and I put a plain question to him lovingly and faithfully. He said to me, "Will you come and see me to-morrow?" The morrow was Saturday, I remember. I went to see the young man, who was the National schoolmaster of the village. Again I put the same question to him lovingly and faithfully as I had done the previous evening. He said "Through God's mercy I can answer your question satisfactorily." "How, when, and where?" I asked. "I was at Cuddesden College, near Oxford, where I was Organist, and after a stirring address which I heard in the chapel of that college, I went to my own room, as the preacher had told me to do, and I would not come out of that room until, obeying the exhortation of the preacher, I had made my peace with God." I need not add, my friends, that the preacher who gave that most thrilling address is the present Bishop of Winchester.

(2) Do not many souls find peace with God—I put it to you—in their pastor's study?

(3) Do not many souls find peace with God at the penitent prayer-meeting? I feel bound to confess, and I do so with great thankfulness to Almighty God, that for sixteen years I have had such meetings after every Sunday evening's sermon; and I must state, too, that God, in this way, has blessed many souls; and that among the number are many office-bearers in my parish.

(4) Can we doubt that souls find peace with God in sacramental confession? There can be no doubt about it. I do not urge it upon my people; I think it almost dangerous to use it habitually. That is my humble opinion; but I am obliged to say, as an honest man, that I believe the Holy Ghost uses this agency, as well as others, to revive in the souls of men spiritual life. And without a shadow of a doubt, during the great Twelve Days' Mission in London, a year ago, the Holy Ghost used all these agencies. It was my privilege to preach in two different churches in London, in which the services were conducted in very different ways, but the results in both cases were the same. Men turned to God, and found the fulfilment of the promise of forgiveness of sins in the name and for the sake of Jesus. If this is the case—and I firmly believe it is—it seems to me that the ministers of the Church of England, with due caution, may use either one of these means of grace, and the Holy Ghost will bless it. The Church of England allows them all, though she does not absolutely enjoin their observance upon us. But whatever we may say about agencies, the necessity of spiritual life must be insisted

upon. Look at our parishes. Allowing that God has done a great deal in them—and He has during the last twenty or thirty years—is not there a sad lack of spiritual life in them? I will not refer to our Communicants, because I am addressing Communicants; but how is it so few members of our congregations are to be found at the Lord's table? How is it so few of our parishioners worship the God of their fathers in the old parish Church? Simply, I believe, because spiritual life has not been insisted upon in the Church of England as it ought to have been. What, then, is to be done?

DISCUSSION.

The Rev. W. DALRYMPLE MACLAGAN, M.A., Rector of Newington.

IN the few moments in which I am permitted to address this meeting, I will endeavour to confine myself to one or two points connected with our subject which seem to me to have been most lightly touched upon by preceding speakers, and yet which are of the deepest importance. I mean, particularly, some of those indirect effects which I have always found to result from such missions as those already described. I need not dwell upon the blessings which have followed such efforts, not only during the Twelve Days' Mission in London, but in other parts of the country where missions have for years past been held; in some of which I have been permitted to take a part. But I would rather call your attention to some results of missions which do not at first sight appear to be so directly connected with their special object.

The work of the conversion of souls is by many looked upon as the great object of missions. Now I believe a work equally (I would almost venture to say more) important, earlier in order, and greater in importance, is the reviving, as distinct from the kindling, of spiritual life in the souls of our people. I am sure that those who have taken part in missions of this kind will bear their testimony with mine, to the fact that the reviving of spiritual life in the hearts of their own people has been one of the most blessed fruits resulting from the missions held in their parishes. What parish priest is there who does not feel downcast from day to day as he contemplates the low tone of spiritual life prevailing among his own congregation? And, on the other hand, what mighty effects might be produced, not only in his own parish, but for the whole Church of Christ, if the spiritual life of our regular church-goers and communicants were far higher than it is! This subject has rightly been put in the fore-front of the proceedings of the Congress, because it lies at the root of all other subjects to be considered. For instance, it is surely this kindling and reviving of spiritual life in the Church that will best give fresh energy to our missions abroad; and looking only at the last subject on the list—the promoting of unity among Christians at home—I hold that nothing will so tend to promote it, or to draw towards the Church those who are now standing aloof from her, as the deepening and strengthening of our own spiritual life. It is thus that we shall best be enabled to draw men into outward fellowship with Christ who have already been baptized in His Name; and all of us will bear testimony to the fact that these missions do deepen and quicken the spiritual life of our own people. First of all, they teach them the meaning and the power of prayer. By gathering our people together in little groups for weeks before the time of the mission, and teaching them to pray earnestly that God would send forth His Holy Spirit to work in the parish, and through those who shall be sent there to preach the gospel, men and women who have long lived in outward conformity with the Church have learned to find a power in prayer which they had little expected, and to believe truly that God is the hearer and the answerer of prayer. There is no power so mighty for gathering in the outcasts of our population, for whom the Church's missions are mainly intended, as the abundance and strength of the spiritual life of our own people; and the priest will find his best efforts comparatively fruitless, if he is left without that upholding which he has a right to expect from his people by the power of their prayers. Again, there is for the most part a dreadful barrier of reserve that separates our people from their Pastors; and it has been the almost unfailing fruit of these missions, that that barrier has been broken down. Those who have before hesitated to come to the parish priest's door, have found courage at such a time to communicate their inward spiritual feelings to him or to others. And such an effect has not been transient, but permanent. It has from that time onward become easier for the parishioners—even those who may not have been affected by the mission itself—to come to their parish clergyman and ask for his counsel, because they have seen others going to ask it before them.

Lastly, I would speak of one—perhaps the most important of all results that follow upon such missions,—and that is, the drawing together both of the clergy and of their people;—the drawing together of men who are looking at God's truth from different sides and points of view, and uniting them together in work in which it is impossible that their differences can be remembered. The teaching them (and it is surely a blessed experience when we have learned it), that there is a higher atmosphere of the spiritual life, in which these differences all vanish in the light and love of God, is surely a work of incalculable value. Men learn to see in others—whom up to that time they had misjudged, distrusted, and perhaps condemned—the working of that same Spirit of God, whose operations, though diverse, are all tending to the same great end; and thus, in the fellowship of such a blessed work, they have a foretaste of that joyous world of light and love where, however much we may differ now, all of us surely believe we shall be able to find a place, and to enter upon the enjoyment of its happiness, without dissensions or disputings, in the presence of Him, whom, amidst all our weaknesses and shortcomings, we have all been endeavouring to serve.

Charles Longuet Higgins, Esq., Turvey Abbey, Bedfordshire.

I am very anxious, in a few humble words, to bring before this great Congress a subject, connected with the one on which we are now speaking, to which no allusion has been made, and on which I think it not very likely any allusion will be made. I mean what I consider to be the exceedingly important subject of Church hymnology, as a means of spiritual life. I cannot but think that a good collection of hymns would be a very valuable means of quickening spiritual life in many of us. In times of Church revival, hymns have always taken a very important and prominent part. Perhaps not less than 4000 hymns were composed during the time of the great reformation on the Continent. We know how forcibly they speak to all of us, and how much they are loved by all members of the Church; and it is important we should do all we can to gain and keep this affection for them. The poor people, especially, love hymns; children, as we know, are fond of committing them to memory; and I think there are many of us who well remember having been taught, by loving voices long gone to their rest, words and hymns which we retain in our minds with deep and loving affection. Now, I believe, that there is at present no collection of hymns sufficiently catholic in its character to satisfy the wants of the Anglican Church; and I for one should deeply rejoice to see (and I think there are many who would sympathize with me) a collection put forth by competent authority, and which of course could not be any other than permissive. I should rejoice to see a collection put forward by competent authority, which may be accepted largely by those in communion with the Church of England all over the world. I suppose, if it had pleased God that our Church should have existed as it has existed without the exceeding benefit and blessing of the Book of Common Prayer, it would be hardly possible to imagine anything at the present day which would be more effective for quickening spiritual life than that book. How it has deepened our convictions—how it has warmed our hearts—how it has stirred up our love—how it has instructed us in many points of deep Christian truth, which perhaps we never should have been able to seek out for ourselves! If it is so good for the English Church to have a Book of Common Prayer, why should it not be good to have a Book of Common Praise? I do not venture to expect that a work like this can make its appearance for some length of time. I know there are difficulties which lie in the way; but I think difficulties are of no use but to be overcome. There are difficulties in the way; but there are those who, if they put their shoulders to the wheel, may well remove them. The chief object I have in view, is to express my earnest wish that the learned and revered Houses of Convocation will be good enough to take this matter into their consideration, and appoint a committee to go into this question. The Wesleyans have their hymnal, and the Independents and the Moravians have theirs. The Americans at this moment are engaged in forming a large and valuable hymnal for the use of their Church. I think we should not be behind them in endeavouring, if possible, to have such a hymnal as shall comfort the hearts and inspire the minds of people belonging to our Church, living all over the world. Why may we not feel, on Christmas-day morning, while using the same liturgy, that we are singing the same praises from a book which we could call the English Church Hymnal? I cannot but think that such an arrangement would be very beneficial in raising spiritual life among many of us. I hope that this matter may be brought forward by more influential persons than myself, and that the wise and learned members of the Houses of Convocation may give it their kind consideration, so far, at least, as to allow a committee to enquire into the question.

The Rev. GEORGE BODY.

I AM very anxious to take up the question where one whom I love with all my heart left it just now, and to whose words you listened with much attention—I mean, Mr. Twigg. I wish to stand by his side; for what I have been enabled to do for the Church of God, has been through his kind teaching. He was my first rector, and I own myself proudly as his son. The question then is, "What is really to be done?" Now I hold that that question has, to a very great degree, been practically solved, both in the days in which we are living and in days gone by. I think if John Wesley could rise up in our midst to-day, that his great and noble heart—and a greater and nobler never beat in England—would beat with exultation and joy as he saw the prelates, the priests, and the laity of the English Church gathered together in solemn conference to consider this question—how the masses of the people may be awakened to the knowledge of the Fatherhood of their God, to the love of their Redeemer, and to the power of the Eternal Spirit. And if this be true, let us remember that John Wesley did in his day, to a great degree, what we want to do to-day. He did awaken Great Britain almost from the northernmost extremity of Scotland to Land's End itself, and the way in which he did it was this. He first of all boldly exercised an evangelistic ministry; and then, as he kindled that spirit, he had the courage to bid men to go forth and preach Jesus, as one has said to-day. He bade the poor mechanic go forth and speak out in strong burning words what the Lord had done for his soul. Now this is just what we are wanting to-day; and I do hope and pray that, in the consideration of this great question which is occupying our attention at this moment, no single thought of party prejudice may come in to mar our work. My position, at least, in the controversies of the Church to-day is not an unknown one—and I am not anxious that it should be unknown; but I yield to no man in our midst in a yearning desire of seeing souls brought to kneel at the feet of Jesus, and by simple faith in Him to find the quickening of the master passion in their being, which shall recreate them for time and for eternity. And amid all our divisions I claim the loving co-operation of every Christ-loving man in the work we are striving to do for the salvation of souls. The great work we have to do is the evangelization of the masses. Now let us distinctly understand what we mean by evangelization. I do not mean the bringing of the people to Church. I don't care about that for itself. I do not mean the bringing of people to the Holy Communion; I don't care about that for an end. I don't mean the bringing of them to confession. It is possible to bring them to confession, and after all send them forth uncleansed and unsaved. What we want is to bring people to love the Lord Jesus Christ, —to kindle in their hearts the passion of a real personal love for Him who died for us upon the cross, and who, even as I speak at this moment, is loving us before the throne. This is the great work which God has put into our hands to do, and therefore you must bring people into the conscious knowledge of, and the conscious response to, that love. There must be the bringing of people into peace with God, into a real conscious knowledge of this love, so that they may look up to Him and say with the confidence of humble faith, "My Beloved is mine, and I am His." This is the work God has given us to do, and if this is to be done there are two agencies needed. We must be allowed to go forth and work, and make the evangelistic ministry a thing of power. May I say it with all imaginable respect?—Don't tell us we must not have mission services for the masses until we have had service of prayer before. Prayer is the end of preaching. Let us get the masses into our Churches if we can; and if we cannot, then into our schoolrooms; and stand up boldly, and speak out in strong, plain, earnest words to them of the love of Jesus Christ. Let those who have control of the next mission tell us if they like that we are to have no services except those taken from the Book of Common Prayer; but let them allow us at least this privilege, in certain districts where we know it is needed, to use no service whatever, but speak right out to men who never yet have bowed the knee to God, that they may end with prayer. I feel this most strongly—you must not limit—indeed you must not; for the love of God, for the love of Jesus, for the love of the Church, and for the love of souls, you must not limit that evangelistic ministry, which must be free with untrammelled freedom in its exercise. Then, on the other hand, I hold distinctly and decidedly that the mission movement is not to be confined to the time of the formal mission. We want perpetual missions in our parishes; and you will find plenty of evangelists if you will go out and seek them. We want laymen who will go forth in cottage lectures and street preaching—women who will go forth in Bible Classes and mothers' meetings;—in a word, a band of earnest Christian people who are desirous of obeying the command, "Let him that heareth say, Come." I do ask you most earnestly to dare to go forth and solve this great question of the evangelization of the masses, by giving, in each of your parishes, a distinct sphere for the exercise of that evangelistic gift which the Holy Spirit has given to many members of the Church, but which the Church refuses to recognise. We must have this; and only let us go forth in the love of Jesus Christ, in dependence upon the power of the Eternal Spirit, and out of hearts beating with love to Him whose heart brake for us upon the Tree, and then it cannot but be that the work which has been given us to do will be done; for the masses shall be reached and England's sons and daughters shall again be gathered around the ancient altar of this dear old English Church.

The Rev. J. H. Titcomb, St. Stephen's, S. Lambeth.

My Lord,—if one feeling has animated my heart since I entered this hall to-night, it is this: that in the words which have been spoken,—words full of fervour, faith, and love for souls,—words recognising the need of a faithful dealing with conscience, and of the real issues of everlasting life and death,—we have had, notwithstanding many differences among us (differences in their respective positions never to be made less of than they are), —the true communion of saints. I desire, as the result of this meeting, to recognise the fact fearlessly before God, that, be a man called what he may, if he love the Lord Jesus in sincerity and truth, he is really a Christian brother. My lord, a great deal has been said upon the official methods, if I may use the expression, by which spiritual life may be kindled in dead hearts. Little, however, has been said of that which ought always to be by its side; viz., the unofficial witnessing of those already awakened; who, by their holy life and conversation, should ever be bearing testimony to what we, the more official advocates of truth, are continually preaching. The case is analogous to that which a court of law presents. Before a verdict can be given, and a cause finally gained, the witnesses in the case must needs speak as truly and faithfully as the advocate. We look, therefore, to you, Christian brethren, as lay members of our Church, to be witnesses of the faith and holiness of the Gospel; standing by our side and illustrating our own more official testimony for the Lord, by your personal, loving zeal—whether it be at the bedside, the mothers' meeting, or in the public thoroughfares of life. But, alas, is it not just here that we fail? Have we not reason to fear that, in this respect, there is too low a type and too formal a state of piety in the Church—a deadness round about us, in fact, which hinders the work which we are endeavouring to carry on in our own ministrations? May I not say that we want not only to be quickened ourselves, but to have every individual unit and member of our congregations quickened also, if any general revival of religion is to be effected among the masses? What we most need is, to have one common flame of love for perishing souls, heart touching heart, and spark kindling spark, until the glowing flame spread on every side around us to the praise and glory of God. It was once asked concerning Whitfield, how it was that he set the world so on fire, "Because he is on fire himself!" was the reply. That, brethren, is the interpretation of the grand problem we are met to solve this evening. If we want to set the world on fire. with holiness and with love for Christ, we must first be set on fire ourselves! It is only as our congregations realize religion, and demonstrate, by their own conversion from the world, the gentleness, and purity of Christian character, that we can expect *our* efforts, however earnest, to be successful. For the outside world will ever take men and judge them as they see them. Hence you will find thousands still untouched, notwithstanding all our agencies for good, if you do not all stand up together with bold front, and united zeal, illustrating the vitality and beauty of religion, by making it speak through your own holy lives. Let us, then, rejoice in a meeting like this, which, after all, is in itself one of the very best ways of solving the problem we are now discussing, because one of the best agencies for kindling and reviving our own spiritual life,—an agency in which we sink, for at least a time, all feelings of jealousy and mistrust, and everything which wars against the unity of the body of Christ;—and where, in the presence of the living God, and under the teaching of the Holy Spirit, we meet for a few moments to wish each other God speed in the work of our common salvation, and thank God and take courage, not only in view of what has been achieved already, but of what may yet be achieved in the future.

Rev. EDGAR JACOB, Curate of Witney.

IN the presence of so many of my seniors, so many who know far more than I do of parochial work, I could not, my lord, but for your express command, venture to speak before this assembly. It would be presumption on my part to speak on many topics; and I shall simply refer to one of the many agencies for kindling and reviving the spiritual life; viz., the agency of missions, by which I mean extraordinary efforts to win souls for Christ in parishes already organized, to win (so to speak) fresh recruits for regiments that have already taken the field. And my subject is still further limited, for I have to speak of missions only as I know them, and therefore any error that I may make will be limited or corrected by the experience of others in a wider field.

My lord, my lot is cast, as your lordship is well aware, in a small manufacturing town, with a population of between 3000 and 4000 people, and the mission of which I myself was a witness, and to which I owe more than, as I value my soul, I would dare to deny, was conducted mainly by one to whom we have had the pleasure of listening to-day,—I mean Mr. Benson,—and one of his colleagues. Of the general character of such a mission I need not speak. Its various details are sufficiently well known and have been frequently touched upon to-day. I wish to speak simply of one thing, and that is the result of the mission on the parish in which I work, so far as I can judge of it; and I think I shall best do this by bringing it out in contrast with two modes of opposition which we had to meet.

Our first difficulty was this. Many respectable people, for reasons which I need not specify, said, "We are perfectly content with our parochial clergy, and we think it an insult to them to request any extraneous aid." If we replied that we were utterly unconscious of the supposed insult, that we needed the aid of the mission priests, and that we had the approval of our bishop—and I beg to say that we had not merely the tacit consent of our diocesan, but his openly-expressed approval given from the pulpit of our parish Church—they stuck to the same argument, and said they were content with what they had. Well, my lord, they may have been content, but we were not, and there lay the difference; and I may mention a striking comment on this objection to our mission from the lips of one of its opponents. A gentleman, a friend of mine, though no friend of the mission, was remarking, in regard to our Easter services, on the large number of communicants, and also on the effect which seemed to be produced upon the clergy themselves, when the lady to whom he was speaking said, "You have given the greatest testimony to the value of the mission." And, my lord, he could not have given greater testimony. In this parish, six years ago, we had only forty-five communicants on Easter-day; last year we had about one hundred, and this year we had two hundred and fifty, and I say unhesitatingly that this result was mainly due to the mission.

My lord, I am bound to bear my testimony to another important point which has been referred to this evening, and to state that the mission priests who came among us did most faithfully represent and co-operate with the parochial clergy. I am the more bound to say this because on one point—the expediency of recommending habitual confession to a priest—the views held by the parochial clergy correspond with those expressed by Mr. Twigg this evening; viz., that such confession is rather intended to be used exceptionally and medicinally:—I am merely stating a fact as to our own opinion, and not presuming to judge those who think differently;—while it was well known that the mission priests were prepared to recommend stronger measures. I can testify that, while retaining their own views on this matter—not of doctrine but of practical expediency—they fell in loyally with the wishes of the parochial clergy, and helped us most cordially in our work. Mr. Benson was speaking of a peculiar love felt by many for the mission priests, and I heard some little laughter at the remark. My lord, I confess it went to my heart. How can you help loving the man to whom, under God, you owe a blessing to your soul? How can you help loving, with an affection which no mere earthly love can rival, any man, be he who he may—the humblest mechanic or the most honoured citizen—to whom you owe a blessing which is not to be valued by time, a blessing for which you will be grateful through all eternity? My lord, of this I feel sure, that not only our clergy, but all who work for God in our parish—our district visitors, our Sunday-school teachers, one and all—we did, aye and do, feel a real affectionf or the mission priests who came amongst us;—that we all went to our work afterwards with happier hearts, feeling that we had gained a blessing to our souls, which we might forfeit if we attempted to deny.

The second objection raised to our mission was its alleged Romanizing tendency. My lord, I am not careful to answer this objection, because, if any agency be condemned *merely* because it is Roman, then the Romanists would have it in their power to prevent us from using any machinery which they might themselves choose to adopt. But I state the objection, that I may bring forward, in contrast with it, the cordial reception which our Mission met with from many dissenters in our parish. More than one Wesleyan offered us the use of his mills for services amongst his men, and I know many dissenters in the district in which I work, who were much touched by the Mission. I remember one man—a nominal churchman—who, when I asked him if he had attended any of the services, replied by asking me whether the preacher were not greatly inclined to Rome. I said, "Go and hear for yourself;" and on meeting him a few days later, and asking what were his impressions of the service, was told—"I liked him (*i.e.* the preacher), uncommonly."

I have now stated some of the direct results of our Mission on the parish, as shown by the increased number and devotion of our communicants, and the impetus given to our parochial staff; facts unconsciously attested even by those who felt unable to go along with us. I have also touched on the effect of the Mission on those most opposed to the very error which it was supposed by some to countenance. Let me say that I believe the indirect good results of the Mission on our parish to be greater still. I have mentioned the love for souls enkindled, as I believe, in the clergy and parochial staff. If this be so, may not the Mission have thus indirectly a continuous and permanent result upon those among whom God permits us to labour?

I must mention one point more. If I, a young clergyman, may be allowed to say anything of my order, perhaps I may be pardoned for saying that we are too apt at times to be content with a clerical routine—with teaching at the schools, visiting the sick and those who send for us, and going our regular rounds. We find the wives at home; but how often do we find the husbands? Ought we not to *seek* for those who may be lost; to search out first one and then another, and to strive constantly to add one and then another to our communicants, (for I believe no amount of preaching unaccompanied by such personal intercourse will really bring more to the Holy Table), and thus to draw souls into the Gospel net? Such at any rate, my lord, is one lesson which the Mission made us realize more keenly than before; a striving after more personal and close intercourse—an intense love for individual souls; a lesson which ought surely to bear fruit in the time to come, and for which, even if it were the only result of our Mission, I for one should be ever grateful.

Thomas Chambers, Esq., Q.C., M.P., Common Sergeant.

As a lay member of the Church of England, I have responded to the request made to me by a clerical friend, to say a few words upon this occasion. I agree in a very great deal that has been said—I differ very much from a few things that have been said this evening. But we are unanimous upon one point, and that is, the object which we all in common have in view. From what has been said this evening, one inference may, I think, be safely drawn, although the truth has been presented from several different points of view; and that is, that if spiritual life is to be awakened or to be revived in the Church of England among the community at large—the general masses of the people—it must be by bringing the truth into contact with the individual soul. A clergyman who holds one class of views may think that that object will be accomplished best in one way; while a clergyman who holds different views may think it will be best accomplished in another. But both are agreed that the truth and the soul must be brought into contact, if spiritual life is to be awakened or revived. Then, if that be so, what is the first inference to be drawn from it? The truth quickens because it *is* the truth. It is the message, then, not the messenger, that is of importance. Authority in this respect is nothing; truth is everything. You are shut up to that conclusion. There is no escape from it. If the truth wins the soul, the truth does win it, and wins it alike whether the man who proclaims the truth comes vested with orders from the highest among men, or whether, because he has embraced the truth himself, he tells it—tells it to his fellow men who need it as much as he did, and who can receive it from him. It is not my *right* alone, if I have embraced the truth; it is my bounden, peremptory, primary obligation to tell it. I cannot act as a Christian in any capacity, if I believe Christian truth, except, in proportion as my opportunities and means allow, I proclaim the truth which I profess to believe; and I want no authority for doing so, but that I believe the truth; for its belief makes it an obligation on me to proclaim it. Do not let us, therefore, go forth from this meeting with an idea that any kind of authority is required on the part of any one, properly in his vocation as a Christian man—a proved Christian man—to preach the truth. If the Church of England has made one error graver than another in the course of her history, it is in a violent attempt to do, through the clergy, that which can never be accomplished except through the Church. I honour the clergymen of the Church of England who have been striving and struggling, with obvious painfulness, to accomplish this task, when, in point of fact, it never was intended by Divine Providence that anything but the Christian Church should accomplish the object they have been attempting. And if there is one symptom more encouraging than another of the times in which we live, it is this: that the clergy of the Church of England are beginning to feel that if they are to do the work effectually in any place, it must be by bringing around them and into active co-operation with them, all the Christian laity of both sexes. I lived in a country parish a few years ago, and went to teach in the Sunday School room. Shortly after I had been there, the clergyman asked me to address the people in that room. Did he do wrong? Nay, should I not have done wrong if I had refrained, though a lawyer and not a divine, from rendering that help which a lawyer can give consistently with all Church laws and proprieties? Let us remember, then, as to the truths of Christianity, that they consist mainly in its facts; for before these facts formed parts of an evangelic history, they were parts of an evangelic tradition: let us remember that we all have them in charge, and that we all have the same obligation to teach them; and the authority lies in *the truth itself*, because the Apostle (St. Paul) who spake by inspiration of God—the greatest preacher of the truth that ever lived—he himself did not put his claim upon his own apostolic authority—not in the least; he put it on the authority of the truth itself. "Though we or an angel from heaven preach any other gospel than that which we have preached, let him be accursed." The authority was in the truth, not in the apostle—in the message, not in the messenger; and in proportion as we speak the truth out, with freedom, and fulness, and force, and faith, just in that proportion shall we do the work which is being done, and which remains to be done, in England.

The Rev. W. H. C. Luke, M.A. Rector of Elmswell.

It is with very great diffidence that I address a few words to this meeting to-night. The references which have been brought before you have for the most part been drawn from those whose experience lay in large spheres of work. My own lot has been chiefly cast in a country parish; and I may perhaps be allowed to suggest that I think it would be an excellent thing for the country clergy, if we had the opportunity, at future Congresses, of devoting a session to the consideration of the Church's work in country parishes.

I think we shall all agree in one sentiment,—which shall be the introduction of what I have to say briefly to-night,—the mission of the Church is a mission to all classes. If so, then every kind of effort ought to be used by the Church, and every kind of machinery brought to bear, for the carrying out of this great mission, for which she is responsible to God. But I think most of us who have had experience, either in town or country parishes, recognise this fact—that there is a particular portion of the community over whom the Church of England has lost her influence—the middle and the lower classes. Of course I am not speaking universally, but only making a general statement. I am speaking rather of a particular sphere of operation: and as a general statement we allow the fact. And I think this fact is further proclaimed by another, viz.—that the classes of society over whom we have lost our influence are the very classes in which Nonconformity has its strength. Well, then, it seems to me very evident that in rekindling and reviving the great work of the spiritual life of the Church, we ought to find some machinery established for reaching this particular section. It is as a paralysed arm to the body, which needs the magnetic spark to kindle it into action. And I think we may, perhaps, looking back to past history, learn an appropriate lesson. There was a period, during the 13th century, when there was a great loss to the Church of these very classes of the people, and the *mendicant orders* were established, and found their sphere of work and usefulness just where the neglect had manifested itself. Of course we all know that the mendicant orders in after times developed into various kinds of superstition and extravagance, but I think, on the other hand, that many of us who have studied the history of the Reformation, must have been led also to regret that in the total abolition of the monastic system, there was not some kind of residue left, providing for the carrying out of that particular kind of work which had been heretofore carried out by that body. There was, it seems to me, too sweeping an abolition of a great arm of usefulness to the Church. Well, then, I think in this present time we need, under the pressure of a similar necessity, to raise up amongst us a body of men chosen out of the middle class, who shall be educated and trained, and sent forth under proper sanction, either as an order of preachers, or an order of missionaries—or call them what you like—for the purpose of reaching these particular classes of English society to which I have referred. And I would enforce this proposal by two considerations :—

(1) Whatever other differences there may be which have alienated these sections of the community into dissent, my own experience leads me to be convinced that there is a great deal of *class feeling* mixed up with the separation. However excellent a clergyman may be, whatever peculiar powers to adapt himself to the special wants of the people he may be endowed with, yet after all there are but few men who are able to get at this particular defect in our system to which I am referring. We want, in fact, a body of men, who shall occupy in the Church of England the position which was occupied by the mendicant orders in the pre-Reformation Church—a position which is occupied by the local preachers, at the present time, in the ranks of Nonconformity.

(2) I further wish to enforce this consideration by another, viz.—that as there is a demand for this work, so, at the same time, we have the opportunity of supplying it. A great deal we have heard to-night as to the desire on the part of the laity for co-operating with the clergy in works of usefulness. I heartily and cordially enter into, and sympathize with, their desires; and would to God they may be carried out. I should like to see them carried out, however, not in a desultory manner, not by a mere spasmodic effort, but to have them organized into a regular system, under episcopal sanction, as parts of the work of the whole Church. We have heard lately a great deal about middle-class schools. Now it seems to me that we have in them the nursery, to a great extent, for providing the very means I am suggesting. Why should not such young men in these schools as feel they have a special call from God for the great work, be specially trained for the Christian ministry? and, if I may follow the example adopted by a previous speaker—I hope I shall not be considered presumptuous—I would suggest a Committee of Convocation being formed to take this point into consideration. I feel it a matter of such vast importance, especially in our country parishes, for the reasons I have stated, as to demand a speedy, an immediate consideration. In fact, there is in this country as it were a vast body of water shut up within its own channel, which seems ready to burst out upon the land. There may be only little rivulets oozing out here and there at present, but let us open the flood-gates, and the rivulet shall become a mighty stream, and the stream a broad river; and so the whole of this our beloved country shall be filled like the other parts of the earth—"with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea."

The Rev. SYDNEY GEDGE, M.A., Vicar of All Saints, Northampton.

MY Lord, Christian Friends,—I have craved permission to say a few words, because there is one very important branch of the subject, which has been altogether passed over this evening. I am in charge of 6,400 souls; but it is not my purpose to say one single word on the subject of the public means of grace. We have heard a number of most admirable addresses upon that point, upon the preaching of the word, and upon all the other instrumentalities that may be employed for the kindling or reviving of spiritual life among the masses of our people, and in the bulk of our congregations. But *the* point upon which I wish to speak is this. I stand forward as a father and a grandfather; and I want to speak therefore on the matter of family instruction—of the means in families of kindling spiritual life—of the means, my Christian friends, which you yourselves should employ in your own families. I think, that if this point had not been mentioned, our friends might have gone away with the notion that all this matter of the kindling of spiritual life might be left to the public work of the Church; and they would not, at all events, have had put before them the solemn responsibility which lies upon Christian men and women—upon every Christian parent, I mean—to labour for the kindling of spiritual life in their own children. It ought to be the case that our work, when we are addressing congregations of professing Christians, might mainly be to build up those who, by God's blessing upon the training of their Christian parents, are already partakers of the life of God in the soul. And that is, therefore, the main point with which I do venture thus to supplement the addresses we have had, by putting it specially before you. You cannot have listened to those addresses, I am sure, without having had your hearts inflamed with love; you must have had fresh zeal enkindled within you. I trust the feelings which have been aroused in my own heart and soul will not be transient, but abiding. At the same time I do feel constrained just to offer to your consideration these few words, and I respectfully thank your lordship for giving me the opportunity.

The Rev. GEORGE WILLIAMS, B.D., Vicar of Ringwood.

I HAVE very few words to say, my lord, and the object of them will be to apply locally what we have heard generally, especially on missions, as one important means of kindling, or rather reviving, spiritual life. I am glad of the opportunity of doing this, because there has not been so much said on one particular branch of this subject as I had hoped might have been said. We have heard a great deal about the twelve days' mission, and I have listened with very great interest to the account we have had of it. The earnest appeal made by the Rev. George Body must have gone to every heart, and will, I have no doubt, have its effect upon those who heard it, especially on the rulers of the Church. But there is one class of missions which, I think, has been productive—there are some here who can testify whether it has been so or not, and none better than your lordship—of the greatest possible benefit to those among whom they have been carried on. I allude to the series of missions which your lordship originated, and carried on for many years, in your former diocese of Oxford. I expressed to your lordship, soon after your appointment to the bishopric of Winchester, the earnest hope that you would establish and perpetuate similar missions in this diocese. I did so because, having been invited occasionally to take part in the proceedings, I had had an opportunity of witnessing the manner in which those missions were conducted. I remember that it used to be a matter of very earnest inquiry with your lordship, with the clergy of the diocese of Oxford generally, and also with those who had taken part in the missions, how far the effect of those missions was permanent. I think I heard very satisfactory accounts, from time to time, from the parochial clergy whom I myself asked, as to the permanent results from those missions. They stated that, although the missions had not produced all the benefit which might have been expected from them, still there was a very salutary and a permanent effect; and therefore I do most earnestly hope that we may have the privilege of trying, whether a great deal might not thus be done towards the spiritual revival of God's work in the souls of men, not only in the great towns, but also in the smaller towns and country villages, of your lordship's present diocese. And I am very glad of the opportunity of expressing to you here, as I have already done elsewhere, this my most earnest desire, as I believe it will be the desire of all the clergy who have had the opportunity of watching the progress of these missions in the diocese from which your lordship has been called to this. It was simply because I did not think sufficient had been said about the manner in which those missions had been conducted—when your lordship fixed yourself with a body of clergy in some particular town as a centre, and then operated, so to speak, on the parishes around, infusing spiritual life and energy into them—that I have taken occasion to say these few words; and to express publicly, as I did privately to your lordship when you first came amongst us, my earnest hope that we may have the opportunity of trying, at any rate, whether like beneficial results may not follow from similar missions in this diocese.

W. E. Shipton, Esq.

My Lord Bishop, I feel how very serious is the responsibility of speaking another word, which may be almost the last word, in such a meeting as this, and after all the wise and holy words already uttered. I rejoice that the attention of this great assembly has been addressed to this subject. I feel it of good omen for the Church of England. I have been at many Church Congresses before, but never at one where the real work of the Church of God in testifying of Christ—the Saviour of sinners and the Lord of men—has been made so prominent, and where, as I would say with all gladness and thankfulness of heart, it has been brought forward with so much distinctness and with such manifestly earnest desire for His glory and the welfare of souls. But while much has been said about agencies for the revival of spiritual life, and something more recently about the agents in this great work, the tendency, it seems to me, has been to direct too much attention to the extension of official agencies, and to the calling into existence of new organizations and fresh forms of effort; and there has been too little recognition of the agencies already existing, and especially of the power of that ordination which is possessed by every believing man that he may for himself do the work of God, and make his own contribution—however small and humble it may be—to the work of the Church and the perpetuation or revival of her spiritual life. May I submit that we need less to call new orders into existence, or to call new agencies into employment, than to use those which are ready to hand, by developing the work and encouraging the testimony of the believing men who are at the side of every faithful minister of Christ. Nor this only in formal and organized arrangements. The duty of every Christian man lies at his own door. For this day at least we are called "to teach every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord;" and this duty can be performed by the Christian layman in the family and in the office, by the wayside and when at work, in modes which cannot be adopted by the clergy, and in spheres which they cannot reach, but which are open to those who seek them under the guidance of hearts moved by the love of Jesus, and which will never be barren of result to Christian workers who are holy in their lives and kindly in their intercourse with their fellow-men.

While we have been considering this subject, words have been ringing in my ears very familiar to many in this room, and which become almost words of authority in this diocese and neighbourhood, both as to the principle and the methods of such personal service for Christ.

"First seek the Saviour out, and dwell
  Beneath the shadow of His roof,
Till thou have scanned His features well,
  And known Him for the Christ by proof;

Such proof as they are sure to find,
  Who spend with Him their happy days,—
Clean hands, and a self-ruling mind,
  Ever in tune for love and praise.

Then, potent with the spell of heaven,
  Go, and thine erring brother gain,
Entice him home to be forgiven,
  Till he, too, see his Saviour plain."

May I take leave to say, my Lord Bishop, that the venerable John Keble did not address these words to you or to your fellow-bishops, nor alone to his brethren of the clergy. They are words of wise and holy counsel to each individual member of Christ's body the

Church; to "the blessed company of all faithful people;" to each and every one who has realized his own acceptance with God through the Atonement and Righteousness of the Lord Jesus, knowing by the power of a God-given faith that in THE CHRIST he has "redemption through His blood, even the forgiveness of sins."

This is the grand ordination for Christian service; the foundation and pre-requisite for every other; and if our clergy and our people generally throughout this dear old Church of England were only living in a deeper consciousness of this power of working for Christ which each believing man has, even in the simple testimony to others of the grace which God has bestowed upon himself, we should need no better agency for the revival of spiritual life, nor any better means for the accomplishment of God's redeeming work in this land, and throughout the world.

The Right Rev. the PRESIDENT.

TIME warns me that I must not call upon any one else, although there are still no less than four cards, upon the senders of whom I should be very glad to call to address you. But there are only a few minutes now remaining before the clock will strike the hour which is to send us away. After the few words I addressed to you at the commencement, I may well add one single expression of thankfulness for the tone which has been manifested from the beginning to the end of these proceedings. The subject has been discussed from very different points, by men of very different minds, and, therefore, with different modes of seeing the same truth; but, I think, with a manifest love to Christ, and to the souls which Christ has redeemed, pervading the whole of the evening's discussion. I do most earnestly trust that we may one and all go from this room with our thoughts stimulated, and concentrated upon this one subject,—with higher desires to know something of the blessedness of witnessing to others of Him whom we have learned to love ourselves, and with greater determination to use, what must be to many of us the very short remaining time of our life on earth, with more earnestness and more simplicity, in this one great work of bringing the gospel of Christ, with its unsearchable riches, home to the souls of men.

May God grant that this may be the fruit of this evening's consultation.

The Meeting was then dismissed with the Blessing.

WEDNESDAY MORNING, 12*th OCTOBER.*

The Right Rev. the PRESIDENT took the chair at 10 o'clock.

THE DUTY OF THE CHURCH ON THE PRESENT PHASE OF THE EDUCATION QUESTION AS AFFECTED BY THE BILL ON ELEMENTARY EDUCATION.

The Rev. A. R. ASHWELL, M.A., Principal of the Training College, Durham, read the following paper:—

I AM called upon to speak to you to-day upon the duties laid upon the Church in this country consequent on the recent action of the State in respect of Elementary Education. I say the duties laid upon the Church; and I would pause for one moment on the question—laid by whom? Those who, like ourselves, believe that the Divine Head of the Church is the same with Him who shapes or permits each phase of human politics, are ready also to believe that every apparent check to her onward progress is but a fresh call to renewed exertion—to exertion, perhaps, in a fresh direction, or after an altered manner, but to faithful effort always. Therefore I need make no laboured defence of my answer, when I say that whatever fresh exertions are laid upon the Church as a consequence of recent legislation, are in reality laid upon her by Him who never suffers any trial to befall her except under such circumstances that, if she do her duty, it may be turned to His glory and her own real good.

It is in this spirit, then, that I address myself to the consideration of what new exertions are required of the Church to meet the altered state of things. These new exertions must, of course, be governed by what the new state of things is. And here I may as well state that I conceive I am called upon to speak, not so much on the duty of the Church during the short remainder of the present year, but upon her new duties after this year is over, and when the new Act shall be fairly at work. And I ask,—what new and permanent work or works will be laid upon the Church when next year comes, in order that her own schools may be doing Christ's work for Christ's flock? Her own schools, I say; for it is no part of my business to speak to you of the new class of Board Schools which the State is going to call into existence. All this I leave on one side. It is enough if in twenty minutes I can touch on the new work the Church will have to do in her own schools, in order to make sure that our own Parish schools be not infected with the secular spirit of the age.

I return therefore to the question, what are the changes within our own borders which we have to meet? How shall we stand after April 1, 1871? For a Christian country it sounds like a paradox, but so it is, that henceforward no school of ours can receive pecuniary help from the public taxes—towards which members of the Church are by far the largest contributors—unless on the condition that no religious teaching shall be given in it except at fixed periods, just after its opening, or before its close; that whatever pecuniary aid is given shall be proportioned to the children's proficiency in secular knowledge, and that alone; and that the Government Inspector is to have no call to take any cognisance at all of any religious teaching whatever. Thus, then, Bible and Prayer-book are at once and totally ignored. All time and trouble spent over such teaching is utterly unrecognised when the day of examination comes round; and the children will see that while their Teacher and Clergyman have been busy over Scripture and the Catechism, the Official examiner knows nothing of these things. Again, while other kinds of knowledge are encouraged by money payments towards the school expenses, *this* knowledge, for the sake of which the Church has been building schools all over the country for these thirty years, is utterly passed by. Now, I need not tell you that, when the same person has to do two things, if he is paid for attending to one and is not paid for the other, it is the same thing as a practical discouragement to the second. A man will say,—the time I spend on the second earns less than nothing, for it takes me away from earning what I might have earned by working at the first. Thus then I say that the new state of things in our own Church schools is not one of impartial neutrality, but of practical discouragement to religious teaching.

So much for the new state of things. Now for the duty hereby laid upon the Church. And here I observe, that I have been called upon to speak of "the duty of the Church," *i.e.*, of the Church as a corporate whole, not merely of her individual members, Lay or Clerical, scattered over her ten thousand Parishes, but in regard of her corporate and collective action. And I therefore ask, What is the Church, looked upon as a central unity, to do by way of counterworking this effectual discouragement, acting at every point of her educational system throughout the land? Now, I fully believe that in Parishes of moderate size, where the Clergyman can be personally intimate with every member of his flock, and where there are Christian Laity of culture and refinement to bring their softening influence to bear upon the poor—in cases like these, I believe that religious training would go on effectually under twenty times the discouragement that this or any other Act could bring upon it. The Christian influence of Clergy and Laity would percolate through any and every barrier of secular precaution. But though more than half the Parishes of England may be in this condition, it is the melancholy result of our social system that full two-thirds of the population of England lie in Parishes where this wholesome intermingling of rich and poor has no existence. In Parishes such as these, sheer stress of numbers utterly prevents the Clergyman from being thus personally known as the familiar friend and counsellor of all his people, even of those who still keep up the profession of being Churchmen; and the more industrious he is in the spiritual work of his Parish, the more inevitable is it that the parochial calls upon him shall make it very unlikely that he can be the personal leaven of his parochial school as well. I speak of what I see and know; and, not being myself parochial, I can say it without fear of being thought anxious to make excuses when I repeat that in the great centres of population—those centres whence the motive power of English legislation is coming more and more—the parochial Clergy have a just right to call upon the central action of the Church as a whole, to supplement their individual efforts to counteract the discouragement thus inflicted on religious teaching.

What can the central action of the Church do to help them? It can help them in two ways; and that most effectually, as I believe. First, by taking securities that the teachers in our schools are themselves well taught in Scripture and the Prayer-Book, and also skilled in teaching children in the same. Secondly, by organizing a universal system of inspection and examination of the religious teaching given by these teachers in our schools, so as to check the first beginnings of laxity. Hitherto the State has done this for us; and it would be most unjust, as well as ungrateful, to the Government Inspectors of Schools, were I to withhold a most emphatic testimony, that, in every case that I have known, they have done their duty by the Church most admirably. The Church will do *her* duty towards herself not merely well, but excellently well, if in future she does no more than fill up the gap which will be left henceforward. If she chooses, she may in some points do it even better; but if so, it will be only by improving somewhat upon their experience, and learning from themselves how to surpass them. Churchmen little know how much of the intelligent fidelity of the great mass of school teachers to their Church has been assisted by the rigid and searching precision of the Government examinations in our Prayer-Book, which all teachers have had to pass before they could hold the Government certificates of merit. I speak of what I know, when I say that hundreds of faithful school teachers date their intelligent convictions as Churchmen from the minute and rigid study of Catechism and Prayer-Book, clause by clause, and word by word, which they never would have had the heart to carry out but for the knowledge that so many marks towards their Government certificate would be the result; but of which, when once accomplished, they found the value in the stamp it left upon them for all time. But they could not know its value till they possessed it. Then, again, it is only those of us who have seen the schoolwork of those overburdened Parishes, of which you in these Counties happily know so little,—it is only those of us who know such Parishes, not merely by ones and twos, but by the dozen and the score,—it is only those of us who know how schoolwork goes on over the wide areas of such Parishes as these, who can fairly estimate the real work which has been done for Christian teaching by the diligent religious examinations of Her Majesty's Inspectors. There are districts, without Diocesan Inspection, where I hardly know what would have become of it else. In many and many a case they have kept the teacher up to his work to an extent he is little aware of; and their examinations have secured that the teaching of the Training College has borne fruit in the elementary school. Now all this goes. Henceforward it is no part of the Inspector's duty to inquire into the religious teaching of the school. Henceforward his examination will be secular only, and being so, it must tend, as I have shown, to discourage, and not to encourage, religious teaching. The change is a double loss. What it takes out of one scale it puts into the opposite one. Again, I say, have not the Clergy of our overburdened Parishes a good right to look to the central action of the Church as a body to stop this gap and to meet this evil?

Have I any remedies to propose? I have. What are they? My statement of the mischiefs ahead is all but a description of the necessary measures of precaution. These necessary measures are two. First, that the Church should initiate a system of examinations of all students in her Training Colleges in religious knowledge: so as to make sure, not merely that they are taught, but that they effectually learn, that sacred knowledge which shall make them intelligent Christians, according to the Church's idea of what an intelligent Christian is. Next, that it should initiate a universal system of religious Inspection and examination of our parochial schools, over and above the secular examination, so as to make sure that the Teachers teach the children what they themselves have learned. There are Dioceses where this is done already. It wants extending; it wants strengthening; it wants the backbone of a vigorous and sympathizing central organization. But how is the Church to act as a body in this matter in her present condition? At all events she has her National Society for Education, of which every Bishop is an acting member of Committee. Have not our Bishops therefore an instrument, ready made to their hands, by which to weld into one harmonious whole the local energies of all their various Dioceses? But would it not be very costly? Not so very costly. Take the case of the Training Colleges first. Already these institutions receive pecuniary aid from the National Society. All that is wanted is that the National Society should say to the Training College—Henceforward we will only give you this pecuniary aid on condition of your submitting all your pupils to our examinations in Bible and Prayer-Book, and we will graduate our payments according to your pupils' proficiency. And speaking as a Training College Principal, I say there is nothing I should desire so greatly as to be put under this restriction. But I should want two things more. One thing is, that the Society should not merely examine my students' knowledge, but that it should also send to every Training College some skilled Clergyman who in his own parochial school has learned what children are—that this Clergyman should set each student to teach some simple lesson to the little ones, and a higher lesson to older children coming forward towards the age for Confirmation, so that the combination of these two kinds of tests be taken to form the result. And then, secondly, I should wish that the total result of these tests be expressed upon a *testamur* from the National Society—as the organ of the Church—like the parchment certificate of the State, so that, when the Teacher goes out to his school, his fitness as a Christian teacher may be guaranteed before he is employed. And this, as I repeat, need entail upon the National Society very little more than additional trouble; and I do not suppose that any one will feel any great objection to giving additional trouble to its broad-shouldered officials. It already helps the Training schools with cash. Let the Clergy and the Laity demand that it do so no longer unless the Training schools prove to its satisfaction that they are doing the Church's work in the Church's way.

I come now to the case of the Parochial schools. And here I feel, as I have said twice already, that the Parochial Clergy have a good right to demand that the Church as a whole should afford them some effectual counterpoise to the inevitably secularising effect of the secular State inspection. The remedy for this lies in Diocesan religious inspection and examination; and, in my judgment, in Diocesan inspection, as braced up, and with backbone given to it, by a vigorous and yet elastic central organization at head-quarters. I have seen something of Diocesan inspection, and I know its strong points. I have seen much of the schools which need it most—*i.e.*, the schools in mining and manufacturing districts, where Christian culture is at a miserable minimum—so I know the needs it has to satisfy. What we want is a system of local religious inspection, which shall receive our schoolmaster at once, and certify from year to year upon his National Society's *testamur*, how far he has acquitted himself worthily as a Christian teacher. In this way the first beginnings of laxity will be stopped. The young teacher going out from his Training College will not have time to get secularised in his work, by the undue pressure of working for the pecuniary results of his secular teaching; for the promptings of conscientious principle will be supported from the very beginning of his career by the wholesome tonic of the Inspector's verdict, which will be recorded year by year on his National Society's *testamur*. He will know that hereafter, whenever he shall seek a re-engagement, the first thing a School Manager will ask for will be this very document; and if in certain cases the result should be that a few unworthy teachers yield to the pressure for secular results, such yielding will thus be revealed at once; they will drop out of Church employment altogether, and our unworthy members will be purged out of the body.

Still keeping to the working details of the measure, I would wish to see the actual work of such Inspector done by local Clergy, who know the local circumstances, the ἦθος of the neighbourhood, and the specific difficulties of the teacher in that particular district. Secular examination may and must be somewhat hard and mechanical. Religious inspection must be friendly and sympathising, or it is nothing. But each local Inspector ought to have an area large enough to give him a certain breadth of view and width of experience on which to draw when enforcing his views on the teacher he is criticising; remembering that there is nothing which will give him such weight with those he inspects, as their finding him full of suggestion and resource drawn from a range of experience wider than their own. I want, therefore, to see the head-quarters, *i.e.*, the National Society, doing what I may call the red-tape part of the work. It should frame an outline of the general standards of religious attainment which such Inspectors should seek to secure, alongside of the several standards of secular attainment reached under the secular Inspector. This it should print and circulate everywhere, through the Diocesan Boards which would be in correspondence with it. It should print and circulate the Inspection Forms, and general instructions to the Inspectors. It should receive the several Diocesan Returns each year, and embody them in one General Report for England as a whole. Then, next, upon condition of its general framework being adopted, it should subsidize every Diocesan Board towards the necessary remuneration of Diocesan Inspectors. For, though perhaps some portion of inspectorial work may yet continue to be done as a work of pure zeal, yet on the whole it should not be so. There should be at least one officer in each Diocese giving a considerable portion of his time to the work, and paid accordingly; while I should wish to see his helpers each with work enough to make it desirable that their expenses at least be paid. We want, then, in every Diocese, one Clergyman as the educational officer, through whom all communications pass and all arrangements are made—the executive, in short, of the Diocesan Board in respect of School Inspection,—whose remuneration should be made up jointly by the Diocesan Board and the National Society, who should be the permanent Inspector, from whom other gentlemen, who from time to time placed themselves at the Bishop's disposal as auxiliaries, should receive counsel and direction, and who should be charged with drawing up the annual report for his own Diocese. This would cost the Local Boards something, and it would cost the National Society something. But remember this:—After this year school-building on the Church's part will be demanding less money than before, so that the funds both of Diocesan Boards and of the National Society will be comparatively free for this new need. Remember also,—that under our new circumstances, the Church's duty will be to take care *to make the most of what we have*, to take care that our schools *really are* nurseries for the Church, and not mere places of secular teaching; and surely it is better economy in the Society and the Boards to spend a certain number of hundreds of pounds a year over making sure of what schools we have, rather than to spend the same in aiding new schools, while all are left open to the danger of gliding gradually down into places of mere secular teaching. Our one great need is *thoroughness within the ground already occupied.* And my conviction is that if Diocesan inspection withdraws itself from secular work and confines itself to religious, if it arms itself with the prestige which it will gain from being brigaded together under the central administration at Westminster, so as to gain the backbone of central system along with the flexibility of local administration,—my conviction is, that the work of religious education may be better done than ever; and that, if the Church thus takes up the duties which Providence is now laying on her, the next generation of Churchmen may yet have cause to thank God for the needs He has brought upon ours.

The Rev. B. Morgan Cowie, B.D., Vicar of St. Lawrence Jewry, and one of H.M. Inspectors of Schools, read the following Paper:—

We find ourselves now in a period of transition from an imperfect system of National Education to a new system, which has for its object to make the education of the people more extensive and less imperfect; and, in so doing, not to lose the assistance of the Religious Communities, hitherto so largely and liberally supplied.

Let us, first of all, recall the causes which have induced Statesmen at this time to make the change.

1. The foundation of the old system was this—"*Government only aids local effort.*" It never took the initiative. Such a system does not deserve the name of National. To secure education for all, it was absolutely essential to do more than this, and to provide means whereby the State should interfere wherever local effort either did nothing, or did what was insufficient in quantity or in quality. There was a large demand that *in all places* there should be provided, by some means or other, Schools in which all children of the labouring classes, without distinction, should be able to get a fair education.

2. The Voluntary system of initiation has, notwithstanding great efforts, failed to provide in Cities, Boroughs, Towns, what was necessary. It could not reach our overgrown populations. It was too great a task for voluntary effort. In many places where Schools have been started there is the greatest difficulty in maintaining them. In some Country places, through negligence or apathy, no Schools exist.

3. The refusal of the managers of Church Schools to accept the Conscience Clause into their Trust Deeds involved the possibility of the exclusion of children of Dissenters from the School, and the consequence was, that either an exclusive School alone was built, or two Schools were erected where one would have been sufficient. That Clerical Managers generally acted on the Conscience Clause principle, while they refused to be bound by it, could not justify the State in helping to build a School from which at any time the children of Dissenters might be excluded. The National Funds, contributed by all, must be expended for the benefit of all. Under the refusal of Church Managers to bind themselves and their successors to respect the convictions of Dissenters, there was a bar to further progress, or a wasteful expenditure of public money.

4. The jealousy of Nonconformists at the share in public Education which the Church was able to take, through its wealth and social condition, and above all through the exertions of the Clergy, was certain to cause pressure on a Government so widely supported by the Borough Constituencies, where Nonconformists have considerable influence. It compelled our Statesmen to attempt to solve the question of National

Education in such a way as not to hurt the susceptibilities of that portion of the population.

5. There was a growing demand for some system of compulsion, whereby the children of the most negligent and needy should be rescued from growing up in utter ignorance, and therefore in idleness, or in unintelligent and wasteful or criminal efforts to maintain themselves. The power of enforcing attendance could not be given to Voluntary Managers, who in some cases are merely *nominally* Managers of the Schools, and who, when they are active, are self-appointed. The new system attempts to remove this difficulty more or less directly.

1. If Voluntary effort does not initiate necessary Schools, a new machinery is created by which they can be provided.

2. Where the Voluntary effort after trial has failed to do the work, the new machinery comes into operation at once.

3. A Conscience Clause is made of universal obligation to obtain assistance from public funds for the annual maintenance of Schools. Schools which decline assistance on this condition will not be recognised as Public Elementary Schools (section 7). Whether or no they will be reckoned as supplying part of the needful accommodation is, I think, doubtful. It will depend on the definition to be given by the Education Department of what constitutes "efficient instruction"—whether attendance at such a School will be a "reasonable excuse" for non-attendance at a Public Elementary School. The scruple about admitting a Conscience Clause into the Trust Deed in order to obtain a building grant disappears by the total abolition of building grants after Dec. 31, 1870. So that, after that period, new Schools must be built wholly by Voluntary effort, or by School Boards at the expense of the Ratepayers generally; and the Education Department must confine its aid to the annual maintenance of Schools, always upon the distinct and invariable condition that Schools, receiving annual grants, must admit all children whose parents apply for their admission, without imposing upon them any condition whatever with respect to Religious instruction, or with respect to attendance at Places of Worship.

4. The jealousy of Nonconformists has been considered, and the management of the new class of Schools is to be under the direction of School Boards popularly elected. This School Board was originally to be at liberty to support Denominational Schools, or Secular Schools; but that liberty is taken away, and the State-aided School is to be a Religious School, the religion being absolutely colourless. I do not believe the Nonconformists are generally pleased with this, and I hope the Churchmen will be alive to their duty in this matter.

5. To School Boards popularly elected, the power of compulsion is permitted. This is understood to be a tentative measure, to find out how, in different circumstances, the compulsory power can be most conveniently and effectually exercised.

The object which was put before me, when I was asked to read this Paper, seemed to me to be this—What advice should a Churchman give to his brother Churchmen on the line of action they should adopt under the altered circumstances?

Though an officer of the Education Department, I do not appear before you in that character. No doubt my opportunities of discussing the question, in various parts of the country to which my official duties take me, with persons of large and diversified experience, with Churchmen and Nonconformists, and absolute Neutrals, have enabled me to learn much of the views, apprehensions, and anticipations of men interested in the Education question; and I trust that I have made some use of my opportunities.

I shall here speak to you —not officially in any sense, but as a Churchman by conviction, and as a Liberal in politics—*i.e.*, I desire to see all the Queen's subjects enjoying equal civil privileges, and living in harmony, with respect for the Religious convictions of those who have any.

I believe this Education Bill has been framed with sincere desire to promote the welfare of the people. Even when its provisions are annoying, I believe they are the least annoying that could have been obtained from the House of Commons. I therefore exhort my brother Churchmen to accept the Bill frankly and cordially—and to use their utmost endeavours to carry it out in good faith. We are no longer dealing with Minutes of Council, which might be altered by battering the doors of the Council Office, and overwhelming the Minister with memorials and crowded deputations. We have to do with an expression of the national will in an Act of Parliament. I think, as loyal subjects and as sensible men, we should accept the new situation with alacrity, not *submit* merely with sulkiness. Let us set to work vigorously to make use of all the opportunities afforded and powers given by this Act for the welfare of the people.

1. Let me take the case of a Parish where sufficient School accommodation is already provided by a National School, or a British School, or by both—or in any way which the Education Department may accept—so that it may be said that the Voluntary School or Schools, already in existence, are sufficient for all the children who may be expected to go to such Schools. If such Schools do not require support from a Rate, no School Board is necessarily called into existence. The Church School, as well as all others, must be open to all who prefer it; and this condition being accepted, the Schools will be liberally aided by the Privy Council, and may go on much as before. Yet I ask—Would it not be advisable in such cases to have a School Board, not for the purpose of making a Rate, but for the sake of obtaining Compulsory power? The Schools not being Rate-aided would not be subject to the restriction in sec. 14 (2), which applies only to Schools "provided by" a School Board. The Managers might cause Religious instruction, according to their own views, to be given to all children whose parents were willing to accept it; and the Board would be able to make regulations for enforcing attendance, at one or other of the Schools, of all the children who at present attend nowhere. The wording of sec. 6 seems to limit the appointment of School Boards to places where there is a want of School accommodation; but sec. 12 enlarges the power of the Education Department; and in clause 1, seems to permit the formation of a School Board in such a case as I have mentioned. I fear, however, that this suggestion will not be acceptable to many. So, as the next best plan, I would recommend the Managers of the Church School, where there is no School Board, to form a Committee of management, elected by Subscribers and the Parents of the children attending the School. I think this would tend to popularize and render permanent the Voluntary School. The only difference in the Church

School will be the necessary adoption of the Conscience Clause principle, a condition already required, to make the School a "Public Elementary School" within the meaning of the Act, and so to entitle it to Parliamentary grant. This compulsory adoption of the Conscience Clause principle will, I believe, be a *great gain* if honestly acted upon, and if the result be what it ought to be,—a full, clear, and systematic teaching to the children of the Church of the doctrines of the Church. At present, in order to secure that all children attending the School should attend the Religious instruction, this Religious instruction has, in many cases, been so watered, filtered, and attenuated, that it amounts to nothing at all but moral teaching, with a knowledge of a few Bible facts; the children, having never learned any reason for going to *Church* rather than to *Meeting*, grow up indifferent; and then it is not matter of surprise that our Church Schools, so called, are unsuccessful in attaching our own children to the Church. Thus I have found it a frequent complaint in North Wales, that the Clergy educated many children in their Schools, but lost them from the *Church* in large numbers as they grew up. I believe that imperfect Religious teaching is the first cause; and then proselytism on the part of Dissenters is vigorous. . . .* Now under a Conscience Clause system there is no reason why all our Church children should not receive full instruction in Church doctrine and in the essentials of our system. Let this be made a privilege for the Church children, and let all others be admitted to benefit of Secular instruction only. What is called indirect influence on children of Dissenters is, under a Conscience Clause system, *dishonest.* Dissenters' children must be admitted without any attempt to influence them in this direction. They should be rigidly exempted from the faintest attempt at proselytism; and then the Church children may have full, clear, definite instruction in the essentials of the Faith. I hail the distinction to be henceforth made, as leading to the possibility, under earnest and faithful management, of making all *our* children truly and intelligently Church children, knowing the distinctive tenets we hold, and not mere "Christians unattached"—words which have no real meaning at all.

2. In places where there is not sufficient room in the School or Schools for the children of the District, and where the deficiency is not made good before the end of the year, a Rate-provided and Rate-supported school must be established, and the preliminary step is the formation of the School Board. Let all Churchmen take an active interest in its formation; let them secure as far as they can a competent Board—not one which reflects their views only, but a fair and equitable representation of the District. My conviction is, that—notwithstanding the care taken to preserve a Religious character in Rate-aided Schools—they will become in reality and in the long run Secular Schools. The energies of Churchmen should, therefore, be exerted to give Religious instruction to Church children by other means. The whole Voluntary effort should be directed *to this object, and this alone.* Here I look to the great improvement of our Sunday Schools; to them alone need the

---

* A passage relating to the mode of building Chapels in Wales is omitted, as I have received earnest remonstrances from some Nonconformists, who tell me that I had been entirely misinformed in the matter. My informants are not convinced of their error; but I feel it incumbent on me to cancel a passage which gave pain to some who affirmed its inaccuracy.

voluntary support be given. A paid Superintendent, with rewards for competent Religious knowledge, will be necessary. I leave this question, however, now. It may come up under some head of discussion. Recollect, however, that in such Parishes or unions of Parishes, a School will have been provided already for the Week-day instruction of the children, and the work of the Clergy will be wholly *religious;* they will not have to tax their own means, or solicit the alms of their people, for the object of providing Secular instruction. The law of the land will have already provided for this great and pressing need—we have no concern with it as Churchmen—only as Citizens and Ratepayers.

3. In Boroughs and those places where the School Boards come into operation at once, there will be two kinds of School—the Voluntary Denominational Schools, and the Schools of the School Board. The co-existence of the two systems is a triumph of the popular principle over the tyrannical attempt to prevent the Religious Denominations bringing up their children in the way they prefer. Those who desire distinctive religious teaching are not to be prohibited the opportunity of receiving it on the same terms (as regards the Education Department) as those who wish to bring up their children with no definite religious views. It is true the neutrals are to get *all* their education at the expense of the Country and the Rate. Those who have something definite to teach will have to pay for the privilege of teaching it; but the League is not content with its partial victory; it breathes out threatenings and slaughter against the Voluntary Schools. In such case there must be a School Board; and my advice is, that Churchmen should make strenuous efforts to secure proper representation of the Church in the School Boards; in particular, to endeavour to exclude (1) all crotchetty persons; (2) all persons who merely will try to save the Rate; (3) all fanatics, whether political or religious. The great danger to be apprehended is, that members of the School Board should have objects beyond or different from the real one—*securing an intelligent population.* This is not an imaginary danger. It has been reported, on the authority of a well-known Member of Parliament, that the extreme Radicals of our country wanted to democratise the people by means of the Public Elementary Schools. I suppose they have a political right to do so, *i.e.*, they have a legal right to use their influence in this direction, but they surely have no equitable or moral right. The object of the State in securing the education of the people is not to promote the views of political parties, any more than it is to further the interests of particular religious bodies. The object is to make all our people intelligent members of the Commonwealth, that they may exercise their political and social rights, and perform their political and social duties conscientiously and with competent knowledge of what they are about. If the Members of the School Board are well selected, and are in earnest for the well-being of the people, I hope that their strong common sense, as Englishmen generally exhibit it, will solve many of our anticipated difficulties. What is wanted is Patriotism, not Partisanship. It is our duty as loyal subjects of the Queen to do all in our power to forward the election on the School Boards of those who will be helpers of the State, and not mere helpers of their own political party. In proportion to our success will the School Boards under the new Act deserve and obtain respect. The presence of some intelligent working men in a

School Board will be a guarantee for the reality and usefulness of its proceedings. Conference with them on the needs and the opportunities of children of the labouring class will prevent some visionary schemes, and save some fruitless efforts; will enlighten some theoretical philanthropists, and will secure the confidence of the parents of the children. I will now notice briefly five other points, which I think of importance.

1. As the religious knowledge of the children will not be a subject of inquiry by H. M. Inspectors of Schools, there is great danger that it may be neglected. Even now I have heard of Church Schools, in which it is given only for about six weeks before the Inspector's visit; and of British Schools, where the condition of daily reading the Bible is kept by causing a Pupil Teacher to read aloud a short Psalm while the names of the children present are taken down. In our schools the religious instruction must be kept up by Diocesan Inspection, which may well be confined to religion, and by rewards for proficiency in religious knowledge, to be earned both by teachers and the children. Without paid Inspection, paid teaching, and money rewards for success, I do not believe that the work will be done in all our Schools in an efficient manner.

2. The suggestion that Ecclesiastical Districts, already sufficiently provided, should be made "Parishes," under a recent Act, to exempt them from being rated for the wants of other districts with which they formerly had Ecclesiastical connection, is, I fear, founded on error—for a Parish or School District is defined to be conterminous with the District for which "a separate poor-rate is or can be made." If the proposed recognition of a District or a "Parish" does not make it a place for which "a separate poor-rate is or can be made," it will not under section 3 exempt it from liability to rates for the necessities of other parts of the ancient Parish.

3. The supply of sufficient School accommodation before Dec. 31, 1870, may in some cases be accomplished, but I am not at all sanguine. The last demand made on the voluntary contributions of the people by the misery and suffering which this horrible Continental war has occasioned, has been nobly answered. This has diminished in a great degree the funds upon which the Religious Denominations might have made their call, and I doubt whether in our case either Diocesan Boards or the National Society will be successful in raising the sums necessary to aid effectually those districts where the need is great, and the means of supplying it small. I may here direct attention to a scheme put forth by the Rev. Morton Shaw, for creating a Loan Fund. As to its feasibility I cannot give an opinion; it is a question for men of business; but if it can be made to work, it solves a difficulty which seems to me nearly insurmountable in the short time allotted for it. Suppose the School accommodation cannot be thus provided, it will be a grievous error if the voluntary zeal is not in this case wholly directed to supplementing the Public Elementary School by good Sunday Schools and other agencies for religious instruction.

4. I have said that I believe the Rate-supported Schools will be Secular Schools in the long run—they will not be far from it at first. The religious bodies should all endeavour to prevent this, but the conditions are not promising. For what do they offer us? A religion without doctrine is no religion; and if such only be provided, the peo-

ple will be unchristianised. Rather than have the children of our poor cheated out of their religion by a false pretence—giving them a stone instead of bread—let the Rate-supported School be regarded by us from the beginning as Secular. Why should we, as Churchmen, endeavour to make the School wear a false appearance? The neutral tint in religion belongs to the indifferent or the sceptic. Let us as Churchmen act as though in the Rate-aided School secular instruction only is to be given—a place where such general morality is to be inculcated as may be founded on the instincts of mankind; let us on no account look upon such Schools as Church Schools; let us join with the religious people of other Denominations to secure for their children what we are bound to secure for our own; let us not patronize the neutral teaching to make our number apparently greater. Do not let us sacrifice Church principles to Church ambition. Surrender all jealousy of Dissenters. Don't think of the dignity of the State Church—it is a thought beneath contempt. Let us seek *equal* privileges for all: mere Establishmentarian pride should be a thing of the past. Let us boldly look our position in the face, accept it, and work under it. I have quoted strong sayings of the Ven. Dean of Chichester in his pamphlet of 1846, when showing that the duty of the State was to provide secular instruction for all the people, and the duty of the Church to provide religious instruction for the children of the Church. Let us make full use of our liberty to teach all who will come to us the doctrines which we receive as words of truth, and not, for a false show of predominance, sacrifice one iota of our Church principles. If we are alive to the position of the Church of England we shall work heartily and zealously on our own lines, and not by imaginary assumptions loosen the hold which I firmly believe the Church still has on a great part of the population.

5. One other point I must mention. We shall have a great number of Schools. We may fill them with children. What will they learn when we have got them together? We want abundance of skilful Teachers; we want to raise the quality of the education given. These things must not be overlooked. I read a few days ago (in the *Saturday Review*) these words of M. Jules Simon—commenting on the state of education in France under the system of M. Duruy—"Schools have been built, and the number of teachers greatly increased, but the quality of the instruction given is as wretched as ever." If such be the result with us, it will not be for want of warning. *Quantity* is not enough—*quality* is required. Look to your Teachers. Do not expect liberal support unless you produce results of value. This point is of great importance, next to that which we have chiefly to discuss to-day.

I must finally apologise for omitting many subjects which will doubtless come to the surface. This paper has been written in Hotels and Railway Carriages, under extreme pressure of other duties, but I entreat my fellow-Churchmen to look favourably on the views propounded. The Education Act is intended to confer a great benefit on the Country. I believe its chief authors have been animated by sincere desire to do justice to all concerned. I think we should trust their sagacity, and their knowledge of what it was possible to induce Parliament to sanction. They knew, much better than Churchmen can know, what were the temper and the attitude of Nonçonformists and Leaguers; and they could estimate, as we cannot, the importance attaching to their demands. They were, therefore, able to hold the balance between rival pretensions. The reception given in the Legislature to their proposals by men of all political parties, and the general concurrence of both sides in the final settlement of the question, ought to make us certain that, for some time at least, this measure is the measure under which we must act. If honestly and fairly accepted, I think it gives the Church and other Religious Bodies the opportunity of doing all that they can reasonably hope to do. Under it, at any rate, the education of the people will not be left to chance, and sometimes to neglect, the necessary consequences of the system which will now, happily, pass away—having served its purpose.

A. J. B. Beresford Hope, Esq., M. P., read the following paper:—

You have invited me to contribute a paper upon the duty of the Church in reference to the new Education Act; and I think that I shall most usefully obey your call by directing the attention of the Congress to certain practical details connected with the religious teaching of our future schools—whether parochial or rate-aided—which risk being overlooked in the multitudinous debates upon the broader theoretic features of the question.

The statement, nakedly put, that the influence, for good or evil, of the School greatly depends upon the character of the Master or Mistress, is so self-evident that it reads like a truism. Nevertheless, this is, I believe, the one consideration which has, during the late education year, most completely escaped general attention. "Elementary Schoolmaster," as a profession, can hardly be said to exist in England. There is the National, or Church, Schoolmaster; there is the British and Foreign Schoolmaster; and there is the Dissenting or the Roman Catholic Schoolmaster. Each of them has been educated for a particular type of school, with the class feelings of that type, and with all his material interests centering in his exhibition of that type to the satisfaction of his sectional employers. Those employers, on their side, seek their employé within the limits of their own section, and the margin of the "taken for granted" on either part is proportionately considerable. Nor is it any wonder that the clergy—to whom the State, no less than the Church, owes a debt, so vast as to be inappreciable, for the wealth of schools already erected and maintained by their exertions—should have felt that the teachers were bound to take their more direct share in the religious burdens of the Parish. All this will, in the coming time, be changed; and woe to the School Manager who fancies he can deal with the Schoolmaster of the future as he has been accustomed to handle the Schoolmaster of the past! The subordinate, seeking a livelihood from men of like sympathies, under the inspection—as to the performance of his religious duties—of State officials paid for that special work, and cut off, except under rare and seldom creditable circumstances, from making his market with the leaders of any other Religionism, will be replaced by the perfectly free and independent professor of elementary learning, willing, competent, and honourably entitled to sell his impartial services to the Church, the Dissenting, or the Secular school, and absolutely released, in his religious aspects, from any State supervision. I dare say that this prospect may be new to many now present; but it is so self-evident, if once it is brought before you, that I shall not waste my time in proving it. I chiefly desire to explain, that, in stating the facts of the case, I imply no reflection on the *morale* of the new profession of Elementary Schoolmasters. The school itself will be everywhere, as it has never been before, a State Institution; while, in contrast, its religious complexion will be ignored by the Central power. Universal secular teaching will, for the first time, be the concern of the State; and so the purveyors of that State-encouraged secular knowledge will grow up, irrespective of the personal religious convictions of each one, just as the attention which the State now bestows upon Telegraphic communication or Public health has created new classes of Officials, who fail or who get on, not as they are Churchmen or Dissenters, but as they show capacity in their respective offices.

The inevitable result of the creation of a body of Elementary Schoolmasters, pure and simple—depending for recognition upon the State rather than on any organism less than the entire Commonwealth, and, least of all, upon their actual employers—must be, by the working of human nature, that the new profession will speedily develope a code of class feeling, class prejudice, and class pride, all its own. Its members could not throw themselves heartily into their work on any other conditions. I mean, that the schoolmaster, whether High Churchman, Low Churchman, Dissenter, Romanist, or Secularist, will be what he is, not as a man but as a schoolmaster; just as the tide-waiter, sanitary inspector, or telegraphist must be; while to each and every one of these will be open the elysium of those strangely-conceived schools at which Christianity—which, if it is anything, must be dogmatic—is to be taught, apart from the formularies distinctive of any Religious persuasion.

The result of this new condition of things must be, that, while (as I trust) the managers of Church schools will make it a duty to live, as far as they can, on a footing of friendship and confidence with the teachers whom they may employ, they cannot, as they have been accustomed to do, rely upon their Masters and Mistresses as instruments, in virtue of their office, of Church teaching. They cannot rely upon them, both because the condition of the teacher will be different, and because the control of the annual religious inspection will be removed. I may be told that, after all, the one thing requisite is to extend the production of Church teachers by erecting fresh Training Colleges, and strengthening those which already exist; and that, if this is done, our clergy and our laity may go on as they have been accustomed, availing themselves of the services of the Masters and Mistresses educated in those seminaries. The development of Church Normal schools is undoubtedly a first necessity of the present crisis. But still this expedient is far from meeting the particular difficulty which I am endeavouring to bring before you. The difficulty is, that the schoolmaster of the future will look for his advancement to his gifts of secular teaching; and that, in proportion as he possesses those gifts, he will be at liberty to disregard the religionism of his casual employer. Now, the better a Training College is, the better teachers, in all respects, will it turn out; and, because "in all respects," therefore in respect of their capacity for communicating Secular learning. So, after all, the Church-trained master or mistress may have as wide a field of undenominational advancement open to them as any other teacher; and the better we make our Training Colleges, the more independent we shall make their *Alumni*. The remedy, which is to be easily found by those who care to seek for it, is a much simpler and cheaper expedient. Hitherto the Master or the Mistress—trained as the servant of the Church, and most frequently inspected by the Officer ordered by the State to help that Church—has been generally accepted as the recognised religious teacher in Church schools. Henceforward, the clergyman, by himself, or in the person of his Curate or his lay-helpers, must, if he desire to maintain the tradition of dogmatic and orthodox religious teaching in the schools of England, undertake the responsibility of providing that teaching. If the master or the mistress be personally helpful, he may call them in; while, as was cleverly suggested at a late meeting, a fund might be raised to supply private capitation grants to the teachers who have succeeded best in their religious instruction. But, after all, the Clergyman must distinctly hold himself free to use or to decline their services under such varying conditions as the circumstances of each school, each master, and each clergyman may require.

The objection which will be probably taken to this suggestion may be summed up in the question, "Where are we to find the time for it?" Assuredly any such disarrangement in the economy of the Clerical week as should involve the expected attendance of the clergyman at school during a given number of the legal religion hours might be at first an inconvenience and a difficulty. You observe I say "legal religion hours," for I am assuming, all through, that the Church schools of the country will generally be placed in relation with the Education Department by the adoption of the time-table, about which I shall have something to say presently. But this inconvenience and difficulty must be faced and overcome in view of the great good which may grow out of the clergyman himself undertaking, as he has not as yet thought of doing, the religion lesson. What is the upshot of the clerical complaint of these last years, reduced to a single plea, but the confession that the clergy have not got that hold of the minds and hearts of the people of England, which, as the ministers of the Church of England, they ought to possess?

How then can they better fabricate the missing link, than by creating and multiplying occasions of personal communication with the members of their flock in those tender years when minds are most malleable? Every child, whose confidence the clergyman may happily win at school, will be his plenipotentiary at home to conciliate the confidence of the old people. The bond thus created, and the excuse of looking after his little pupil, may frequently afford a graceful excuse for a domiciliary visit, which it is often very difficult to explain, and which, however well intended as a first step at setting up some degree of familiarity with the hard-handed and stubborn mechanic, not unusually results in ruffling tempers which mistake surliness for independence. Besides, in course of years, these very children, thus educated under the clergyman's eye, will themselves have grown up into mechanics and mechanics' wives.

Talk of pulpit influence!—the school-desk will be the most powerful pulpit; and all the more so, if the clergyman has the ability to work his school teaching and his Sermons into each other. If his Teaching is interesting, the Time-table will soon become an obsolete formula, except so far as it helps the clergyman to map out his own daily engagements; while he will go to the Church on Sunday, knowing what he has been saying during the week, and ready to drive it further home, while the Nonconformist preacher will be comparatively at sea in his attempts to keep pace with the parson's school instruction.

But, after all, the clergyman need not be, and ought not to be, alone in the work of supplying religious teaching. This is the age of co-operation for good works among Clergy and Laity. One section of Churchmen creates Guilds, Brotherhoods, Sisterhoods; and another establishes Societies; but, under all names, the movement betokens an age of religious activity; and the danger sometimes seems to be, lest the impulsion of being active should outrun the judgment in settling what to be active about. The coincidence of so great a demand upon co-operative activity among Church-people as that which the present crisis makes, with the revival of the co-operative instinct in the Church, may without offence be called Providential. I do not pretend to offer any general rules for the organization of Lay help towards religious teaching. The germ exists in the band of Sunday-school teachers spread over the land; while I venture to think that, in proportion as the day-school teachers of the future can give their time, the instruction which they offer will be more telling because it is offered upon a week-day. No doubt most of those present can point with satisfaction to instances in which week-day lay help already supplements the work of the paid teacher in Parochial Schools. That which is wanted in this respect is exactly what is required in the Volunteer defences of the country—extension and methodizing. The methodizing I mean is both central, and that which lies within each special circle. There will be parishes in which very much must be left to the teacher's discretion, and where the more formal discipline of an Association will not find place. In many other places, particularly in crowded towns, the machinery of a Brotherhood or a Sisterhood, with its rules and its private devotions, may be highly advantageous in face of the organized array of vice against which Christianity has to contend. But, in whatever form this Lay help is asked for or offered, it must work in subordination to the higher unity of Church doctrine and discipline, as well as in friendly co-operation both with the parish clergyman and the parish master and mistress. Tact, good sense, and good humour—in a word, the spirit of giving and taking—far more than any crystallized organization—will, after all, be the preservative and curative elements in the system.

Finally, after exhausting all the expedients of local co-operation, the powerful aid of diocesan Inspection must be invited to encourage, to strengthen, and to harmonize religious teaching from parish to parish. I have already referred to the abolition of the compulsory Inspection of religious Teaching by the Government Inspectors. The Church is bound to supply the lack in the most formal and complete manner. Such inspection ought, as far as possible, to be made compulsory on Church schools, and—as was laid down at the recent diocesan meeting at Canterbury—the Inspectors ought to be paid; a special fund being raised for the purpose. Lastly, the annual education meeting of the diocese must be cast in a more synodical and deliberative form than that of the familiar Platform with its pre-arranged resolutions. Rather, I should say, the educational crisis is another strong argument for the revival in the Church of that synodical action for which we are craving, to guide and moderate our counsels.

I cannot leave this portion of my subject, without offering a few remarks upon the Time-table Conscience Clause. Churchmen were naturally startled at the wholesale and drill-serjeant-like interference with the special arrangements of each particular school involved in this arrangement; and they overlooked possible considerations, looming in the uncertain hereafter, which may not unfrequently make the Time-table system conservative of Church influence and Church teaching in the schools of the future. I have presented to you the professional school teacher, as he or she will be moulded by events. Let us, then, take one of these teachers—an average person; one out of a thousand, honest and steady, but neither a hero nor a missionary:—and let us suppose that he or she contracts an engagement at a distinctive Church School with no particular intention of continuing there in case a more remunerative engagement should present itself elsewhere—probably at a rate-aided school; supposing, further, that the Clergyman is apt to devolve the religious instruction on his Teachers, and only puts in an occasional appearance at School:—it will be obvious that all the teacher's worldly interests will be in the direction of making the religious lesson as colourless, if not as short, as possible, and thereby earning a character with future employers for Churchmanship of the most undogmatic description. But, with a time-table which compels the teacher to devote a given time, at a given hour, to religious teaching and nothing else, the length of the lesson is secured, and its importance, compared with other work, guaranteed; while the Clergyman will always know when to come down and exercise a wholesome supervision. Besides, as every well-regulated school must at all times have had a time-table for its own use, the injury is, after all, not so great, of making that compulsory by law which was already compulsory by common sense.

I have been hitherto reviewing the position of the Clergy in Church Schools. The more difficult question remains behind; of their duty in regard to rate-aided schools through which the chimera of religious teaching, apart from distinctive formularies, is to range unchecked, and from some of which religion, even in name, may be banished. There the Master and Mistress will hold their position on condition of not teaching as the clergyman ought to wish them to teach; while the Clergyman will be himself forbidden to supplement, within the School building, the defects of the system by his own explanations. Place will be against him, and time will also be his foe; for he will be a dexterous and an earnest man, who can systematically keep together a class of children, who have already toiled through the school day, for religious teaching in another room. But, in proportion as the difficulty is great, the danger of neglecting the attempt must be transparent to all who value the purity and fulness of the Catholic Faith. Here and there the schoolmaster, hired by the Board, although itself elected on the principle of Minority Representation, by the cumulative vote which makes unanimity impossible, may, in spite of the exclusion of distinctive formularies, teach the Faith which those formularies were framed to embody. But in too many cases, however virtuous and personally pious the Master or Mistress may be, the religion, which stress of circumstances will drive them to expound, will be a creedless system of vague philanthropy, illustrated by detached tales, garbled rather than drawn from Gospel history. No clergyman, who believes in his mission, could stand by and not endeavour to find some remedy for this condition of things. How he is to do so I do not pretend to say; but I am certain that he must seek it in the same expedients, of personal exertion and invited help, which will enable him to regulate the religious instruction wherever the school continues to be directed by Church influence.

ADDRESSES.

The Rev. Canon Walsham How said:—

I HAVE no doubt that the Church's duty in regard to the new Education Act is to make the best of it. I do not pretend to like every part of it, and especially I am a little anxious as to that perennial fount of new Minutes in Whitehall, which may some day or other become somewhat too exuberant, and deluge us with any number of Revised Codes. However, an Education Act was necessary; and I doubt much if in any other hands we should have got one less detrimental to the cause of religion and of the Church. One thing we must learn to acknowledge, however unwelcome the acknowledgment may be,—and it is a truth, which, at a Church Congress, where we look at everything from a Church point of view, we may be in some danger of forgetting—*the Church is not the Nation*; and this is a *National* measure. It was obliged to be broader than our limits. But it might have been destructive too; and I am very thankful that it is so Conservative as it is.

Well, of course the subject divides itself into two parts—the provision of Schools, and the management of Schools when provided. Everybody is by this time so thoroughly up in the first part, that it would be absurd to waste time upon it, pressing though it is in importance. I should think no measure was ever so universally studied by the Clergy. Why, it has made ten times the stir among us that the Reform Bill made. I will only say, on this first part, that it is the bounden duty of the Church to keep School Boards and Rate-schools out of as many Parishes as possible, by providing thoroughly good Schools of her own, and that there is not a day to be lost.

But as to the second part—the management. This again bifurcates. There are the old Schools, and there are the School-board Schools. The old Schools will go on pretty much as at present, except in the cases (I hope very few) in which new Rate-schools will rise by their side, and then inevitably jostle them out of the field. This will be the case in some Town Parishes. But on the other side, there will be hundreds of the old Schools which, with better buildings, better teaching, and better grants, will flourish better than of old; and a good many new ones of the old sort will, I hope, be at once provided by the Church, and probably by other religious bodies. Let it be distinctly noted that the Act does not in any way discourage what are called denominational Schools. It suggests no superiority in the Schools to be provided by School boards over the old. May we not go farther, and say that it really sets its seal of approval to the present system, giving every opportunity (with the necessary exception of London, and with the exception also such places as themselves petition for the introduction of the new system) for the supply of existing deficiencies before setting in motion the new machinery? True, we have the Time Conscience Clause—a perfectly needless annoyance to the teachers in a vast number of schools. Surely it would have been sufficient to have adopted Canon Norris's suggestion, that the Time Regulation should be enforced only when the General

Conscience Clause was taken advantage of by any parent. But there it is; and, whether we like it or no, we must fit our Time-tables to its requirements. It was not meant to be vexatious, no doubt, and was jumped at as rather a happy thought, when first suggested; but it strikes one as one of those little bits of legislation which are sometimes to be met with, and which depend for their existence rather on theoretical conceptions than practical acquaintance with their subject matter; and the Clause will certainly be troublesome enough in large Schools.

And now to come to the crucial question—How far can the Church act with the new School Boards? It is plain she cannot promote them; but can she work with them at all? Take a Parish in which it has been found impossible to raise funds to build or support a School:—the Government steps in; a School Board is established; a School is built and supported by a Rate, and then the Cowper-Temple Clause comes in. No distinctive religious Catechism or Formulary can be taught in that School. Of course we Churchmen don't relish this altogether; but if we want to get fonder of it, do let us think of the chance we had of our new Schools being actually forbidden to teach anything either distinctive of, or antagonistic to, any Religious Body whatever! One has really seldom met with a more skilfully exhaustive summary of the Catholic Faith. At any rate now the master may teach according to his conscience, and is not to be tortured by that excruciating contrivance which would pledge him not to state anything positively, because somebody does not hold it; nor anything negatively, because somebody does. Or should we like better Lord Russell's magic Chapter? But now, to come back to my question,—Suppose I have a Parish with a School under a School Board, how am I to act? Possibly the School Board won't let me act at all, and there's an end of it. I must then devote myself to the Sunday School, Night Classes, and all I can do in other ways. But this is my answer. If they will elect me on the School Board, I will serve. If they will make me one of the Managing Sub-Committee of Three, I will do my best. And if they will allow me to help the teacher by giving the Scripture lesson in the School on certain days, I will do so. I think I should be doing right in thus acting, and I do not think I should be compromising principle. Of course I should carry out the intention of the Cowper-Temple Clause like an honest Englishman. There must be no subterfuges or unworthy tampering with the matter in any way. If I wanted to make the Bible lesson an opportunity of proselytising, I would have nothing to do with it under the new Act. I don't do this now, and I should not then. And, from my own experience as a Diocesan Inspector for seventeen years, I do not think the Clergy in general do so. I look at my present practice, and ask myself what would be the difference in it were I taking part in the religious instruction in a School under a School Board, as I have suggested. Of the five mornings in the week, one is given to the Church Catechism, the other four to Bible lessons. I should simply have to make all five Bible lessons. This would, in my opinion, be a change very much for the worse; but still the power to teach Christ's little ones the Holy Scriptures freely and fully is surely a power one should not voluntarily resign. I do not forget that a Dissenting Minister would have exactly the same right as myself to offer his services to the School for the same purpose,but I am not afraid of the competition.

And now this is only half the question; but the other half is so obvious, that it barely requires to be stated. If we are debarred to some extent from distinctive teaching in the Day School (I speak, of course, of places where the new Act takes effect), we *must* make a point of more distinctive Church teaching in our Sunday Schools. I should not have advocated the course I have as regards the Scripture lesson in the Day Schools, had I not felt that we have it in our power to supplement those lessons with thorough Church teaching on Sundays,—at least for all those children who are left by their parents to our spiritual charge. We must teach in our Sunday Schools ourselves, when we can, and we must teach our teachers to teach. The Church Catechism must be more of a Sunday Text-book with us than it has been. Let us catechise upon it in Church, in which work we shall find a valuable help in Canon Norris's "Catechist's Manual." And we may add to the Church Catechism, for our older children, Mr. Arden's admirable little "Supplementary Catechism."

Let me say one word as to our Training Colleges. These must be supported with all our power. It will be of incalculable importance that the Church should retain in her hands the supply of Trained Teachers. Though it may be heresy to say so, I am not at all sure that the securing of a thorough Churchman as Master in a School is not more important than teaching the Church Catechism.

On the whole I am very hopeful. I do earnestly trust that the Church will not lose her vantage-ground as the Teacher of our children. I even hope that the very danger anticipated to a distinctive Faith, will make the Church *more* resolute in giving such a Faith to all her children by every means in her power. I believe the day is still far off, when the Clergyman may no more be seen running, as Mr. Young describes John Keble as doing, when he thought himself late to open his school in the morning, along the "Long Walk" in his garden,—alas! the only point, in the life and character we all so deeply revere, in which I dare pride myself that I completely follow his example.

THE RIGHT HON. W. F. COWPER TEMPLE, M.P.

MY LORD,—The friends of Religious Education have hardly rested from the labours of an arduous campaign before they are obliged to consider the plan of operations for another campaign, which will not be so laborious, but which, I trust, may be quite as successful. Most of the gentlemen I see on this platform have taken an active part in that struggle; and I believe most of you who are present have taken an interest in it. The campaign that is over was directed by means of public opinion to influence legislation: and the campaign that is commencing is an attempt, by means of public opinion, to influence the execution of the Elementary Act in the districts where the new schools will be brought into operation. The field of action is different, but the principles are the same—the spirit of indifferentism on the one side, and the zeal for religious teaching on the other. It is an important thing in such controversies to be clear on the main question at issue. For want of definiteness it often happens that eager combatants direct their fire against those who really are their allies, and weaken their defences against the most formidable attacks of the enemy. The assault against the Educational Measure was directed in two columns of attack—one was to extinguish the existing voluntary schools, and to upset the system which had been benefitting the country for the last thirty years, and the other was to get Parliament to treat religious education in Elementary Schools as a thing so unnecessary and superfluous that it was not worth while to have it at the risk of exciting sectarian differences. It was urged that as every party could not obtain that in which they differed, they must be deprived of that on which they were agreed. The attack against religious teaching in rate-supported schools could only have been consistently made by the secularists. But by assaulting existing schools they obtained the help of the most active Dissenters. Victory, however, declared for the advocates of religious education on both points. The voluntary schools are preserved, and will continue, with the increase of Government aid, as long as they meet the wants of the parishes,—as long as they are supported by those who value them for the religious instruction which has been referred to to-day,—and if they maintain their efficiency, and come up to the condition required of public elementary schools. Upon the point at issue, whether in rate-provided schools there should be religious instruction, there need be no conflict between Churchmen and Dissenters. The antagonism is simply between those who consider religious instruction from the Bible an integral and necessary part of Education, and those who object to it. I am struck by the great responsibility thrown upon every one in the districts where, under the Government measure, the provision is declared not to be sufficient, and where there must be necessarily formed a local board. The responsibility, which has hitherto been taken upon themselves by the promoters of voluntary schools as to the religious instruction, must now be thrown upon the ratepayers, and upon all who have any influence in these districts. And see what an important matter it is which is thrown upon us, and which we cannot evade. It is whether the proph . y which has just been made by Mr. Cowie shall be fulfilled or not; that is, whether these schools shall be secular or also religious. Now, I would submit to Mr. Cowie's authority upon any question of fact, but I have a great confidence that his prophecy in this respect will not be fulfilled; that the rate-supported schools will not become secular. They cannot be distinctive, but they can, and they will be religious. They will be placed, under the influence of public opinion in those districts, in a position in which Elementary Religious Education can be given, though not under the sole direction of the parish clergyman. They cannot be Church of England Schools in a technical and outward sense, but they can be in a wide and inner sense. I heard a very unfavourable allusion just now to a clause which is known by the name that I bear. As the father of that clause, I may, of course, have some partialities, and therefore I will not express any opinion upon it, but will only speak of what it really does. It prevents a school from wearing the external badge—the outward mark—of belonging either to the Church or any other denomination—that sort of external character which is given by the use of a formulary distinctive of some religious community. But it does not do what was just now suggested—it does nothing whatever to prevent the freest religious instruction being given out of the Bible,—that being the text-book instead of the Catechism. Accordingly the reproach made against it by the opponents to the Act, was that the clause was an illusion, and left denominational instruction unfettered if given orally. What does it do? The schoolmaster may teach every doctrine contained in the Catechism under the freedom which the law allows. The law, I think, mainly by the acceptance of that compromise, left the religious teaching in the rate-supported schools as free as the religious teaching in any school whatever, with this exception,—that there shall not be in any school a formulary distinctive of any denomination as a text-book. Do we believe schools are so much influenced by the text-book used in them? Is it not clear that the really efficacious teaching is the loving, sympathetic mind of the teacher acting upon the mind of the child? and does anybody say that the Bible is not a sufficient text-book for the children in these Elementary Schools? These children have not the capacity to be taught dogmatic theology. What is wanted there, is that the foundation should be laid on which our clergy or appointed teachers may, at the proper time, build the fabric of their dogmatic and special teaching. They may get that elsewhere—either previous to confirmation or at the Sunday-school, or at any period when the clergyman thinks it desirable they should have it. But the great point is, that all who value religious instruction, whether members of the Church or members of Dissenting bodies, should see that the great issue which is going to be raised wherever these School Boards are to be appointed, is the question whether Elementary Education for the children of the lower classes ought or ought not to include within its range such religious instruction as a properly-chosen schoolmaster can give out of the Bible. The Board, it must be remembered, will have the selection of the schoolmaster. And what can be more important? They may choose a man penetrated by that religious influence which we believe to be essential to the proper cultivation of the whole being of a child—of his spiritual, of his mental, and of his moral qualities; or else a schoolmaster who thinks everything relating to the supernatural is unnecessary, and who confines himself to the mere mechanical departments of reading, writing, and arithmetic. Another very important point entrusted to these School Boards will be the application of the compulsory powers; and it is a matter of great importance that these powers should be exercised with judiciousness and with careful consideration of the circumstances of the locality. We must feel that the only hope there is of getting the children of this country fully and properly educated, is that some form of obligation should be applied to compel the idling, wandering, untrained children to go into the school; and still more, that some compulsory action should secure their regular attendance. But the problem to be worked out is, how—when the children are unfortunately so necessary to poor parents for the means of their livelihood—how to enforce these obligations without running counter to the feelings, or, I may say, to the prejudices of the country. I think that in these matters we ought to see the friends of religious education prepared heartily to accept and work the new Act. It would be a great misfortune if the Church and the clergy—to whose exertions and zeal are owing the bulk of the Elementary Schools in the country—were, from misconception, or preference for other modes, to neglect to enter into the new field. And if I, as a layman, may venture to express a view I entertain of the position of the clergy, which perhaps is not quite identical with one recently stated, I would say that they must in this matter remember that they are not only ministers of Christ but are also ministers of the National Church. They have not fulfilled their vocation when they have ministered to the congregation acknowledging them as pastors: and when they manage schools placed under their authority, they have a calling to the whole of their parishioners,—they have a duty to the whole nation to which the Church belongs. They are to enter into sympathy with every good movement that stirs the hearts of the people; they are to show by example that religion is diffusive, not exclusive; that it includes philanthropy and benevolence in every practical form which they may assume in their parishes. The public mind and conscience have at last been awakened to the sad spectacle of large numbers of poor children growing up in our great cities, and in some rural parishes, untaught and untrained. Parliament has provided means for bringing all these truant children under the influence of education. Ought the Church,—ought in particular the clergy,—to stand aloof from this new crusade against ignorance and vice? Ought they not rather to offer themselves as the leaders in this as in every other good and righteous popular movement? Will they not continue to bear the chief burden of Elementary Education, and take their share in those labours which prepare for victory and ensure success? If, as I believe, this is the general view which the clerical profession take of their calling and duty in the present crisis, I can say, as a layman, that they will meet with ready and cordial support; that if they will lead in this direction they will find numbers to go with them; and that with proper organization, and with a real, zealous, and hearty good will, we shall run no risk of seeing this new Act of Parliament working out into secularism, or making religion that chimera which my honourable friend, Mr. Hope, was so afraid we should see. I do believe it depends upon Churchmen, and upon all who value religious education, to make this Bill successful, and to lay in the elementary schools of England those foundations of the knowledge of Scripture history and of the precepts of the Gospel which are required by these children, and which will form a preparation for the further education which may be given them in after-life.

DISCUSSION.

The Rev. Canon Melville, Worcester.

I hope the Right Honourable gentleman who has just sat down will still have the wisdom which is said to attach to those who know their own bantlings, after I have made the few remarks I have to make with reference to that clause which bears his name. We, as members of the Church, have all been at work lately, and still are, in building up the waste places, wherever they may not have educationally been occupied, and in fortifying the weak places of our own community. But there is a pressing question beyond, and which we have now passed into—namely, what are we to do with those new Schools which, after all, inevitably will arise, build up and extend as we may? We know that in many of the big towns the Act is in operation already; and any one who is familiar with the smaller towns, will know there is here and there in them some one district, in which, from incapacity of one kind or another, the clergyman is obliged almost, or at least is willing, to take advantage of the provisions of the new School Bill, and therefore a School Board will arise. And though this Act is termed a Supplementary Act to the old system, we shall all see in these different districts, that, in its actual experiment, it will not be of a supplementary, but of a supplanting character. It will be impossible, of course, that the voluntary School can hold its own where the rate-supported School rises up along side of it in its own district. Let us face it then at once. The Act certainly does not proscribe religion, but it certainly also does not prescribe it. It at best only permits it, and that too in the terms, and under the operation, of the Clause which bears the name of the Right Honourable gentleman. Let us look at what this plain fact involves! Look at Mr. Matthew Arnold's Report on British Schools in the last Report of the Education Department. He proves plainly that if religion is left to that condition which the Cowper-Temple Clause imposes, it will either be a dim nebulousness vanishing away into nothing, or else it will be this,—the predominance of some one point of doctrine, through the predilection of the teacher for that point, till it becomes an excrescent deformity. The truth will suffer in one case from a want of life and spirit, and on the other side hardly less through the disproportionate teaching into which it will be forced. We are asked,—what is the Church's duty under this condition of things? I am not here to propose a concession which it is wise on all hands to make, but to urge the maintenance of that which it is wise at all hazards not to lose. Let me urge it through one argument. The honourable gentleman in his paper, and one or two others, have referred to the training colleges. They are the key to the position; and in this respect we are strong, because many of the training colleges belong to ourselves. Their maintenance, their augmentation even, is a duty incumbent upon the Church; but after the students leave the colleges, they may pass away into a different current, unless something is done at the same time to guide and direct them on their course. And to guide and direct them with regard to what else may become a nebulous or distorted teaching, I think is the plain duty of the Church at this crisis. They will want, and we should supply, some chart and compass, if not the pilot aboard; and the second division of the 14th Clause does not necessarily exclude us from framing some sort of form or system which may be a *vade mecum* in reference to teachers and clergymen in the religious instruction of these rate-supported Schools; and if we are to keep our firm hold upon them, and influence them in any shape worthy of the name of systematic religious teaching, we must address ourselves to supplying the condition there wanted, namely, the form and substance, without which such teaching will be so evanescent, if existing at all, when the School is left simply to the Schoolmaster undirected by any systematic method. This may not be exactly a palatable truth; but we are asked the duty of the Church in the present crisis; and I can see myself that out of this, if we face it honestly, yet firmly, may grow a most advantageous position. It does not follow, because we establish a system according to the requirements of the Act, that everybody instructed under it so far shall abide therein. The Church grappling with the new System under the Act, unpalatable as it may seem at first—doing nothing to precipitate it or even to promote its increase—but facing it and closing with it, as she surely should when it is forced upon her,—a blessing may ensue in the return to herself of many who would be otherwise lost to her teaching. The Church would thus gain the co-operation of many of those Nonconformist brethren who would gladly join with us in some stricter and more definite form of religious teaching, in order to preserve its daily and permanent influence; and thereby be drawn into closer contact with the Church—it may be even into full membership. What I desire the Church to face is this. There is the power conferred by Parliament last session, and, all past predilections and old associations notwithstanding, we should unite ourselves closely with the School Boards, not insidiously, but openly and loyally, to exercise the powers, and take advantage of the trust, conferred thereon. In the carrying out of the 15th Clause, and in gaining the confidence of the deputed three to whom the management of the School may be committed, the Church might fulfil its duty to that religious Education with which it is specially charged. By such means I think we shall accomplish this—we shall save these Schools from drifting into secularism, and we shall also save the Church from drifting into denominationalism; for I endorse the statement of the honourable speaker who preceded me, that the Church should look upon herself as national as long as she can, and be most unwilling to pronounce herself merely denominational. To this end we should address ourselves to some definite scheme of religious teaching, which, while it is in *bonâ fide* conformity with the requirements of the Act, shall supply to those requirements those necessary and absent conditions of form and substance, without which the religious element of popular Education, if allowed to exist at all, may want either the life or harmony of Divine truth.

The Right Rev. the Bishop of OXFORD.

I SHOULD not have offered myself to your notice in this discussion if I did not think there was a danger of one point being probably overlooked, or at all events that view of it which I shall try to bring before you. A great deal has been said about the importance of improving or extending diocesan inspection. I thought from the general manifestation of opinion, that it seemed to be regarded as an important matter; but it has been understood that diocesan inspection is hereafter to be different from what it has been. I think it was Mr. Ashwell who said that diocesan inspection must withdraw itself within certain limits. It has been represented to me that the general opinion is, that diocesan inspectors under the new system should take to themselves the province of religion, leaving to the Government Inspector the remainder of the Education. That is a very natural conclusion from the circumstances in which we find ourselves; but I venture to think it is an entirely false one; and that it will be a great misfortune if what has hitherto been the only opinion expressed, should be the opinion ultimately adopted—that there should be in every Church school one examination in the whole range of knowledge on the part of the State Inspector, and another examination on the part of the diocesan inspector, confined to religion. I think it would probably result in many cases in this state of things,—that a school, which would perhaps be pronounced to be the very best school by the Government Inspector, would be the worst in the eyes of the Diocesan Inspector; and that which the Diocesan Inspector may recommend as an admirably instructed school, may be stigmatized in the report of Her Majesty's Inspector as an inefficient place of Education. And as a further consequence, those who are the enemies of religious Education would say, "Here is your religious school; what is it worth?" I wish to see diocesan inspection far more earnest and full than it has been, and I wish to see an inspection of the whole teaching of the school, stimulating and guiding its managers and teachers, so that the religious school should also be the best general school. I should deeply regret if we, who have in our hands the conduct of the inspection of Church Schools in various dioceses of England, should in any way abdicate the position we have hitherto taken in enquiring into the whole state of the schools we visit.

Well, we are told, there are three persons going to be much changed. There is the Government Inspector, the diocesan inspector, and, as Mr. Hope put so well before us, the schoolmaster. Now, as to the Government Inspector. If they were all such inspectors as Mr. Cowie, of course, everything would be right; but it is very plain we shall have another race of inspectors, and when the existing officers are promoted or superannuated, their successors will, of course, enter office on principles different from those of the men to whom we owe so much now.

But I don't see why we should be so much alarmed. You know a little tract headed, "Why are you afraid of the policeman?" and the answer a forward young gentleman was said to have made upon seeing that heading, was, "I am not afraid of the policeman,"—which, of course, did away with the necessity of answering the question at all. "Why am I afraid of the Government Inspector?" Why not adopt the same language, and say, "I am not afraid of him at all?" If my school is a good one; if I am really teaching and educating the children as well as children can be educated in all the branches of ordinary Elementary Education, what harm can he do me? I am entitled to have a Government allowance wherever these elements of Education are properly given. But there is another person to be changed—I mean the Diocesan Inspector. I speak in connection with a diocese, which, perhaps, has the best diocesan inspection in England,—

a result greatly due to the long and distinguished rule of the President of this Congress. But even speaking of their inspection, admirable as it is, it may be amended, and it must be amended, I think—not, I say, by abdicating secular inquiry, but by making the whole inspection more important, and clothing it with more public interest.

I have gone into a school as an Inspector, and no one was present,—no one interested in it except myself. Two days, under Act of Parliament, are set apart for the examination or inspection of a school, apart from that which the Government institutes. There is no reason why these two days should not be great Red-letter days in the school. There is no reason why we should not mark it by a festival, and make the time one of happiness and gladness for the children. The Diocesan Inspector comes and meets the School Managers; prizes, perhaps, are given; a school-tea is held; and they all make a day of it. Or, we might have one day exclusively for examination, and the other for enjoyment; but the two days might be so arranged as to give a character and a spirit to the whole school. I back that influence against the influence of the Government Inspector; but I am not going to say a word against him. You see, he is limited by Act of Parliament; he must not put warmth and colour into his inspection; we can put as much as we like into ours. The Inspector has simply to come and make his examination, and to furnish his reports. If he puts in anything having the appearance of sympathy with particular views, or a shadow of prejudice, of course the Nonconformists on one side, Churchmen on the other side, would be down on him directly. Therefore, I say, we can meet him with our days against his. But I don't want to be in opposition to him; let us go together. Let his report bear witness that the Church school is the best school in the neighbourhood. I want the Inspector to be able to say, "Your religious school is a school where any parent may be glad to send his child."—Then there is the schoolmaster. Of course the schoolmaster of the future may, as Mr. Hope pointed out, come from a class, and from a previous education, which we should mistrust; but he may come, on the other hand, from a good training school, and be a good, religious man; and the minister and schoolmaster may be, as they have been, in many schools already, friends and allies. I believe the root of the matter to be there. If I were still engaged in the work which half my life has been given to, I should not fear this Act one bit. I am sure I should have the teachers as my friends, and that they would be fond of the school, and interested in its progress; and I am sure there are many other clergymen who would have the same hopes and prospects, if they began by keeping friends with the schoolmaster, and associating with him; and that the schoolmaster would be unconsciously doing their work, whether by the help of the catechism or not. By making the schoolmasters our friends, our schools, notwithstanding rates and School Boards, may be a source of joy and benefit to the Church; and we may do a great deal of good in the promotion of religious knowledge among the people of this land whom we are called to serve.

The Right Hon. Earl Beauchamp.

After all that has been said, I think I should have kept in silence, if it were not for some remarks which fell from Mr. Cowper Temple, and which, if left to themselves, might lead to great misconstruction. I hope he will, therefore, permit me to supply his omission; and the observations I have to make under this particular head will come more fitly from a layman than a clergyman. Mr. Cowper Temple said that if the clergy would lead in this new movement of education, they would meet with enthusiastic support. I feel bound, as a layman, to ask, who have led in this question of education but the clergy of the Church of England? All statistics and reports confirm, what our individual experience proves, that they are pre-eminently the friends of education, and have brought the education in the country to its present condition. We have the clergy alone to thank for the great strides which the question has made. As a layman, I desire to bear my testimony to the heroic exertions and great pecuniary sacrifices which the clergy of the Church of England have made to found and maintain schools, too frequently, and especially in the smaller parishes, almost unassisted by laymen. They have struggled to provide for the young of Christ's flock that education which it is their duty to give; and I should be sorry to say anything in this Congress with regard to the future, which did not at the same time, convey to the clergy of the Church of England the sense entertained by the laity of their great and successful exertions.

Now for one or two practical points. I for one cannot prevail upon myself to take that sanguine view of the future of state-aided schools. I believe the clause known as the Cowper-Temple Clause is destined to bear bitter fruit to this country; and I therefore hope every effort will be made in the present and in the future to maintain the voluntary system, in opposition to that of the rate-aided schools; for you must remember we shall not have Mr. Cowper Temple to interpret his clause, which would have to be determined by the Committee of the Privy Council from time to time; and, judging from the past, I cannot bring myself to believe that the interpretation which will be put upon the clause by the authorized officials will be in accordance with what the Right Hon. gentleman endeavours to lay down. When you say you cannot teach distinctive formulæ, you mean one of two things. That is, you are either to teach distinctive doctrine in other words, or not to teach it at all. Now, we believe every doctrine in the Church Catechism to be found in the Bible. But I want to know,—looking at the matter from a Church point of view,—will the Committee of Privy Council tolerate the teaching of such a doctrine of the Catholic faith as baptism, founded on the text, "Suffer little children to come unto Me?" If the Government refuse to tolerate the teaching of the Church in rate-aided Schools, I suppose all Churchmen must deplore the establishment of School Boards; but if, on the other hand, we are permitted to have denominational teaching, taught out of the Bible, shall we not be keeping the word of promise to the ear and breaking it to the hope. To avoid, therefore, all doubt upon the matter, I hope that rate-aided Schools will be avoided as much as possible.

There is one most practical point which has not been touched upon; and I am speaking to many here who are managers of Church Schools. I think it is of the utmost importance to us that we should preserve the Freeholds of our Schools. So long as we do that, we may submit to terms from year to year for the annual grant; but it is necessary, looking to the future, and the consequences which may afterwards be entailed upon us, to retain the Freeholds, and preserve them in trust for the Church, whatever may happen hereafter. Annual grants, we know, may be offered from year to year; but if we don't like the conditions attached to them, we need not take them. If, however, you part with your Freeholds, and allow them to be transferred to the School Boards, you will be parting with the most valuable part of your educational apparatus, which, probably, you will not be able to regain. Therefore, I hope that if the School Trustees and Managers find, through circumstances, that they are unable to maintain the Schools upon the present voluntary system, and that it is necessary to come to terms in any way with the School Boards, I hope they will avail themselves of the powers of the Act to lease them for a nominal or other sum, instead of allowing them to pass into other hands in perpetuity. And the benevolent purposes of the Act would be extended just as much by [these means, and the interests of the ratepayers would also be as fully promoted; but I caution you against parting with your property entirely, and thus losing the Freeholds of our Church Schools.

I also wish to touch upon something which fell from Mr. Cowie. It is with great diffidence I venture to differ from one who has had such practical experience in the work of education and inspection. But I listened with some alarm to his observations with reference to the Government grant, and the application of the Conscience Clause, in connection with which he mentioned that we were not to proselytise the children of Dissenters. Now, it appears to me, that the Conscience Clause in the Act of Parliament differs greatly from the Conscience Clause which has been urged upon the Church in past years. The Conscience Clause hitherto in force forbade teachers to teach children doctrines to which objection was taken; but the new Clause is one to enable parents to withdraw their children. The obligation is therefore altered. It is removed from the teacher, and thrown upon the parents, who may withdraw their children from teaching of which they disapprove. That liberty being given to the parents, I think it imposes upon the Managers of Schools the privilege and the duty of seeing that all the children who are not withdrawn, are fully instructed in the Catholic faith, according to the teaching of the Church of England.

The Right Rev. the Bishop Suffragan of Dover.

I have come to learn what I can for my own Parish. I, with my brother Suffragan, whose work lies further north, stand proudly at the head of a body of Clergymen,—I trust not a useless body in the Church—the assistant Curates; and I came here to-day to learn what I can for the benefit of my own parish, or rather parishes,—of East and West Kent. I am glad to find, my lord, that for the most part, not wholly, we have been agreed to day not to fight over again needless battles—not to strive to prop up against the wall and beat down once more to the ground those dead bodies which night after night, during the past Session, strewed the Parliament arena. Of course, it is perfectly reasonable and natural that each one of us Clergymen and laymen should still hold to his own conviction—to his own deliberate opinion as to the best kind of religious national education. But, at the same time, it is equally necessary for us now to meet manfully, face to face, those influences which have been evoked, from this or that cause, from the abyss of political and social agitation or speculation. When the shipman finds that the wind has suddenly changed—that it is no longer abaft and favourable, his duty surely is to trim and alter his sails, in order to meet the change of surrounding circumstance; and if he cannot make the desired haven by a straight course, to attain that object by methods, possibly not so direct, but nevertheless, every whit as honest and legitimate. Many believe that had we been left alone, the system which, (thank God,) has not been ineffectual for the past thirty years, would shortly have found its perfect fruit in filling the vacant spaces of our land with not inefficient Schools. I use the adjective advisedly. Who knows better than the Clergyman of a parish that here and there are the children whom no persuasion whatever can drive into the National School? And so now the Legislature has interposed; and I think if there be a grievance to Churchmen, it may be summed up in this small compass,—viz., that the whole matter has been somewhat sudden, and that we had very little notice, and have very little time in which to turn ourselves round. But Parliament says to us now,—(and when anything is said about the duty of obeying the law, I venture to ask, who but the Clergy are the first teachers in every parish of obedience to the law?)—Parliament says, "Moral persuasion and gentle compulsion are not enough; some more powerful engine must be brought on to the scene and set in motion. You shall build Schools large enough, not merely to hold the children who will come to school, but those children who will not come." The thin end of the wedge will be soon followed by the broad end—the less gentle compulsion of the Magistrate, and the 5*s*. fine. That is, as I take it, the challenge thrown down before us, and we take it up readily and cheerfully. In the different meetings held about the country in various dioceses—in your lordship's diocese, the diocese of Canterbury, and elsewhere—we have looked the situation well in the face, and have determined, God helping us, in the short time at our disposal, to do our best to fill this gap and to meet this emergency. We believe in the Education we are giving to our National School children. As to the religious difficulty, we have never met with even the ghost of its shadow in our parishes, and I trust we never shall see it. We believe in the Education we are giving—the mingling of secular with definite religious training. And now we have it in our power to make the most of this Act,—an Act framed under circumstances of extreme difficulty, carried through Parliament, and brought to its present condition, only by the most indomitable patience of that man to whom we owe so much—Mr. Forster, a man not necessarily the friend of the Clergy or the Church but one who feels and recognises the fact that Education owes much to the Clergy and the Church. Taking our stand now upon this Act—upon our own principles and upon the principles of the Church to which we have the happiness to belong, we can go on educating the children of the poor entrusted to our charge, if only we determine to exert ourselves. One last word,—for that alarm-bell which lies in ambush there, beneath the Secretary's finger, reminds me I must cease. I believe firmly that, if at this crisis we were to act in any other way whatever—if we were to show the slightest symptoms of faint heart or a feeble mind—if we were to content ourselves with folding our arms and drifting helplessly and hopelessly towards this untried order of things, the very first to lift up their hands and eyes in utter amazement, the very first to point the finger at us as deserting the flag under which we have won so much Educational success, would be those who, perhaps, often only in the heat of discussion, (for we honour many of them for their works' sake, as in their hearts I trust they honour us,) have said the hardest and most unkind things of ourselves as a Church, or as Educators of the English people.

J. H. KENNAWAY, ESQ., M.P.

I AM sure you will all think it is a matter for great congratulation that at this special time when the Church of England seems to be so much upon her trial before the world and the nation, there should be this unanimous testimony spoken of by Earl Beauchamp, and others, extorted not only from our friends and from Parliament, but from our foes also, that she was the first to discern the interests of Education in this country, and to resolve to step forward to supply the deficiency. This I maintain has given her a vantage ground which no accident of situation could have done; and I think many will have felt it hard that when she had a special claim upon the consideration of the country, this special claim should have been met by the imposition of a special disability, and that those forms which she had deliberately chosen as the best vehicle for conveying religious instruction should be forbidden in the new Schools. At the same time, the friends of the Church and of religious Education felt that it lay with them, when this compromise was offered to them, to decide between accepting it or throwing their force against the Bill, and perhaps ensuring its rejection, and incurring the responsibility of prolonging an agitation—no one knew how long—and that which was the most pernicious of all, a religious agitation. Therefore it was that they consented to accept this compromise, feeling after all that it affected the form more than the substance, and that, while the liberty of religious Education was continued to the Church of England, she need not be afraid of not holding her own against all opposing obstacles. But we must leave the past and look to the present; and one cannot but fear that with many, looking at past labours, weighed down with past sacrifices, and perhaps disgusted at the treatment they seem to have received, there is some inclination to remit their exertions and cast upon the State entirely that responsibility which for the first time she has taken upon herself. I hope if this is to be the thought, it will be but a momentary one. If the Church of England is to maintain her high position, as she has done through past ages, and is doing now, she must rise to a sense of her new responsibilities—she must show that she, at least, however narrow others may be, can adapt herself to the new circumstances, and can hold her own, as she has always done hitherto, remembering that as her exertions are, so will be her influence—as her sacrifices, so her success. Turning to practical things, we shall, without doubt, endeavour to carry on old Schools, encouraged by the additional grant which is promised. I hope that we shall step into the new fields opened to us, and in the short time that remains, that we shall avail ourselves of it by building new Schools and supplying the deficiencies. I believe the Church will do this; I believe she will not entrust those whom she has tenderly loved and cared for to the tender mercies of a School Board, or to men who think it their first duty to keep down the rates, and their second to educate the children. I think the Board will have an obnoxious task in recommending a new rate to the inhabitants, rendered the more so by the fears of the community. I think the rate will not be found acceptable; and without appealing to the sacrifices made in the past, and our endeavours in respect to the future, we shall have the people on our side.

One other word. I feel that in working out this Act, so long as we abandon no principle, so long as we distinctly claim our religious teaching, it will be a great thing, as far as we can, to co-operate with Nonconformists. By so doing we shall strengthen the hands of the Church, promote harmony in our parishes, and find that after all, the bonds which unite us, are many more than those that keep us apart; and I am sure we may look for good results. In the Church Schools, worked as they will be under the Conscience Clause, the Members of Dissenting bodies will be as it were the guardians of that liberty of withdrawal from religious instruction which the State has afforded in regard to their children. I would ask you to consider whether it would not be possible in certain cases to ask a Dissenter—as a matter of course, a pious and religious Dissenter—to become one of the managing body. I think then, instead of his being an outsider looking on with suspicion—I refer of course to cases where Dissenters are in a large minority—you will have him on your side, and instead of objections being raised and difficulties cast in the way, there would be a great incentive to a harmonious working of the whole system. We must remember that liberty of religious instructions has been conceded to us in the face of the assertion that there was no such thing as a religious difficulty. Let us be resolved by these means, such as I have been putting forward, to harmonize the working of this Act, and give no cause to the enemies of religious instruction to say that by our religious dissensions we are hindering the Education of the children of this country.

The Rev. J. B. Sweet, Vicar of Scalby.

However wise it may be for a lady, who finds herself forced into an undesirable union, to scan in the most favourable light her prospects of future happiness, I think wisdom dictates that she should also consider what will be the difficulties with which she may be brought into contact,—what the constitutional, moral, or other impediments to happiness she may have to meet. Now, on the same ground, however hopeful the prospect of the working of this new Act may be, as preceding speakers have depicted it, by the aid of the faithful clergy never deserting a plank of the ship so long as it will float beneath them, and by that tender interpretation of hard clauses, of which we have had such questionable illustrations this morning; however great results may arise from cordial co-operation so long as we do not sacrifice our principles, we must not close our eyes to certain features of this Act,—to certain leading characteristics of it,—to which the attention of the Education Department itself, by means of this Congress, may be profitably drawn, and which certainly are not favourable to the happy conclusions hitherto arrived at.

As I am situated, in a parish with a coast-line of thirteen miles, with six self-rating townships under my own charge, and with schools eight miles apart, and all large schools, affected by this Act, I have been called upon to give close attention to its provisions. And I conceive that the Department, which possibly may work with the most favourable results, may as easily run its head against a passive opposition of a character it has never contemplated. For the Act bears most hardly on the very men who had sacrificed time, toil, and money, and manifested great earnestness from a quarter to half a century, for the promotion of that very object for the advancement of which the Department was instituted. Now, I would warn it first of all—(1) That if they bear hardly upon existing efficient teachers, by cashiering or snubbing them simply because uncertificated, they will raise a passive resistance throughout the land:—(2) Secondly, that by refusing to recognise efficient voluntary schools as public elementary schools, they will certainly run counter to our most reasonable feelings and interests:—(3) And thirdly, that by a sentimental use of their arbitrary powers in regard to real or supposed improvement of school premises—for example, as to windows, which one inspector may declare should be diamond-shaped; while another, perhaps, by-and-by, will say they must be of plate-glass —by requiring wooden floors, where the population walk in wooden shoes—by demanding that fire-places and windows shall have a distinct mathematical relation—by requiring a quarter of an acre for a play-ground in a country place where thousands of acres are open to the population—or by snubbing a good teacher on account of mere provincialism —they may move us to a passive resistance which would be ultimately fatal to the measure.

Further, this resistance may be provoked (4) by enforcing the addition of a Conscience Clause to old and new school deeds over and above the Time Table Conscience Clause of the Act, or by requiring a conveyance deed at all where the grant is only annual and the school has been hitherto supported by its owners. Again it may be aroused (5) by persisting in giving only the same three months for building grants, and six months for improvements or additions, alike to small and extensive parishes, whether to one such as I lately left in Norfolk, which you might almost cover with a pocket handkerchief, or to one such as I now hold, as large as half of what a diocese ought to be; or (6) by not giving equal compulsory powers to Voluntary as to Board Schools, both with regard to attendance and sites. Certainly, in the matter of attendance, the managers of voluntary schools should have equal power with boards, and should at least be enabled to compel children to attend, if they neglected to do so, by showing just cause before a Magistrate. The Department may further merit resistance (7) by not suffering a free education to be given in the one school as in the other, and by thus again putting voluntary schools at a disadvantage as compared with Board Schools.

The necessity for such a warning as this is forced upon my conscience by certain other indications of the spirit which breathes in this despotic Act,—I mean (1) the power taken under the 12th section to force a School Board on a district already both efficiently and sufficiently provided—(2) The palpable concession to a creedless minority, patent in almost all its provisions—(3) The sort of *bribe* held out to men to form themselves into School Boards by the almost uncontrolled permission to effect a lavish expenditure at the cost of other persons, and by the license to pass bye-laws, and by their exemption from the cost of legal proceedings, provoked by their own peculiarities—and (4) by the astounding and most invidious fact, that whilst rate-built schools cost their promoters next to nothing, and furnish an inferior article, their managers themselves may actually be paid for their work at our cost, whilst voluntary schools, really educating, and costly to their promoters, may receive no aid whatever.

I have one or two suggestions to add in conclusion. For there is a great danger, quite apart from those things I have mentioned, lest School Discipline, of which the Department has never shown an intelligent idea, but which is as important to a useful Education as sound teaching, be rendered impossible by the folly of Boards and Committees, and by that departmental love of popularity, which may encourage parental interference for political ends. I would warn Congress and the public against trusting either to indefiniteness in religious teaching, or to that sentimentalism which discards chastisement for repeated offences. In every Elementary School we must labour to subdue self-will, and fit our scholars for subsequent usefulness, by enforcing respect for authority, whether temporal or spiritual. But this can only be done by firm discipline going hand in hand with sound doctrine, and by the School rules not only being written upon the doors, but actually carried out, so that neither parent nor child may with impunity dispute or disregard them.

The Rev. Henry Brass, Incumbent of St. Matthew's, Redhill.

I should not venture to take up the valuable time of this meeting by making a speech; but I merely wish to suggest a difficulty which has occurred to me, and which I think will become an increasing difficulty under the new Education Scheme,—and that is, the want of a more comprehensive, or if you will, supplementary Church Catechism. Our own Church Catechism is especially intended, as you see by the preface, for candidates before being confirmed by the Bishop, and it is confined almost entirely to subjects connected with the baptismal vow and a few remarks on the sacraments. I think we want something more distinctive of Church teaching—of the reasons why we are Churchmen, why we hold Episcopacy, why we do not approve of allowing people to choose their own form of religion, and to think it does not matter to what "denomination" they belong. I have found in practice that the Church Catechism does not prevent our children from becoming Dissenters without any reason or scruple, and without perceiving the inconsistency of the act. The only part of the Catechism with which Dissenters generally would not agree, is the first part, which chiefly relates to godfathers and godmothers, of whom, I am sorry to say, the children know comparatively little. It is true that a clever teacher may draw forth from the Church Catechism many doctrines and points which do not appear on the surface; but it often happens that School masters and School mistresses are not able to do this, or by previous Education have become so "liberal" in their ideas, that it is a matter of indifference to them to what denomination the children may belong.

The Rev. J. ERSKINE CLARKE, Derby.

WE have to bear in mind, in dealing with such a question as this, the great difference there is between town and country. I have to speak of a town parish in a manufacturing district, where we feel that it would be wholly impossible for us to resist long the onward sweep of School-boardism; and therefore it becomes us, in doing our duty to the Church, to make the best of what is before us. I think that we as Churchmen have a duty to School Boards, and that we ought to take care that Churchmen are upon the Board, in order that we may use for our Schools the power of compulsion which otherwise we cannot have. We have used "moral suasion," as it is called, to the utmost; but yet there are many children, of parents well able to pay for them, who need to be brought into our Schools. I think we must have our influence on the Board, or else it will be used against the Church. The Boards in towns will consist of Laity, of Clergy, and of Dissenters, but those who will do the work chiefly in our towns will be the ministers, and if the Clergy withhold their power, the Dissenting ministers will use their influence, and get what they have been long looking for with longing eyes, but which they have not at present—a day school of their own. They will set up a rival School to which the name and influence of Dissent will be given. Surely that would be a great misfortune, and we should therefore endeavour to have a strong Church influence upon the Board—to make the School Board as good as we can,—to deal with the Board Schools almost as outposts of the Church, and to spread as much Church influence as we can through them: for though debarred from the use of creeds and catechisms, we know that common things may be taught in a very different way by men of a generous Church tone and character, than by men of a narrow dissenting spirit. And the appointment of the teacher would be in the hands of the School Board. I think if we had the School Boards as outposts under the influence of the Church, we might leave them to educate the very poorest children of our parishes, for whose sake we now have to keep the School-payment so low—and thus, raising the school fee, we should be less dependent on the annual School Grant, to which undue importance has been attached, as if Schools could not be maintained without State aid. But State aid may be purchased too dearly; and I hold that we have stretched concession to its utmost limits, and that, if much more strain is put upon us, we should be bound to give up State aid altogether. If we have a good Board School in the Parish—then, raising our fees and the character of our Schools, we might hope to have the Education of the flower of the children of the artisans, and also the children of the middle classes, many of whom are now taken away from our Schools to be "finished" at some other School, for no other reason than because they pay sixpence a week instead of twopence, as in the National School. And I am not speaking on mere theory. I have in my School nearly 100 boys paying one shilling and twopence a week, and many of them are sons of railway artisans, and they pay that for schooling under the same roof as 200 boys assemble who pay only threepence and fourpence. I think our duty in respect to this Act is to endeavour to exercise the maximum of influence on the School Board, as well as the maximum of influence through our own Church Schools,—to maintain our control over our buildings and by no means allow them to depart from us, and also to endeavour to provide that which was forcibly insisted upon in the first paper—a thorough Church inspection, by Inspectors coming with equal *status* and dignity to the secular Inspector, and coming with the authority and under the influence of the Church of these realms.

The Rev. C. D. Goldie, Vicar of St. Ives, Huntingdon.

There is one thing I like about the Education Act,—and that is, that it has awakened us all. One great object of the Education Act is to arouse us to supply all the deficiencies we can lay our hands upon. There are two things which I consider it most important to observe. In the first place, in regard to the supply of sufficient Educational accommodation, we should deduct from the total population a fair proportion for those who find education for their own children. This seems not to be taken into consideration, but it is desirable that it should be.

I feel that we should do all in our power, (it is not altogether in our power,) to get a fair influence over the Town Councils, in large towns, who determine the School Boards and who bring the whole of the schools in the district under the discipline and under the action of the Education Act. I think there are one or two things with regard to our Church education most desirable. I am not all satisfied with the doctrinal instruction at our Church Schools at present. We have heard a voice from America which tells us that our Church boys go out there without any real knowledge of the special differences between Church and Dissent, or understanding why they are Churchmen; which I consider is rather a disgrace to us. I therefore hope we shall have more distinctive teaching of Church doctrine and Bible truth. For this end, I beg humbly to suggest that a series of good text-books, and a proper scheme of religious education, should be drawn up, whether by the National Society or any other institution, under the authority of the Church. I know something in this way has been done, but, after an experience of many years as Diocesan Inspector, I think all these arrangements are most vapoury, and I hope we shall have this matter mightily improved.

Then, again, with regard to the subject of the school teacher, I see no reason why we should not, as school managers, make a portion of the master's stipend dependent upon his school passing well the Diocesan Inspector. This may be done in the way of a capitation grant, if thought desirable, or a portion of the salary may directly depend upon the report of a person appointed by the Bishop. I think this latter plan would be desirable, and that it would work well. But how to get the money? You have money to pay your masters now, and you may make that payment partly dependent upon one thing and partly upon another; but I think, if extra payment is required, that the country and diocesan Boards, instead of always using their funds for building of schools, may also make grants for the sustentation of schools. I want to say one word more in regard to another department. Have you really thought of the action of this Act upon infant schools? Remember that the whole instruction of infant schools is of a religious nature. I believe the infant school in a parish to be a better missionary than the parson himself. The infants learn their hymns, for which they have a love and affection, and carry them to their parents at home; and I believe many parents have learnt more of the facts of our Lord's life from these beautiful hymns, than from anything else I have taught.

Again—I do heartily disapprove of the clause of the Right Hon. gentleman who has spoken in its favour. It seems to me that we are giving up very much in religion when we give up the formularies. I am going to say an unpopular thing—that I strongly disapprove of the almost universal detestation manifested to the word *dogma*. What is dogma, my friends? It seems to me that dogma is the incarnation of truth. I am sure it is possible, and probable, that if we were to give up dogma, we should be in danger of losing that which the dogma contains. I do not like giving up the text of the Church Catechism, because the Church Catechism contains the Church of England's dogmatic assertion of great truths.

The use of formularies was, in my opinion, far too easily given up at the time of the discussion of the Bill in Parliament, and, however honestly meant on the part of the Right Hon. gentleman, his clause was really a cession of one of the strongholds of the Church of England.

The Right. Rev. the PRESIDENT.

ALTHOUGH I have five most interesting cards in my hand, the time being up, I must observe the rule laid down. There is one point, however, which has not been noticed in the discussion of to-day. Hitherto, the fact that our certificated and pupil teachers really know something of religious teaching has been tested by the papers given by the Government Inspectors. But let us remember that this will now cease; and if they are left alone in regard to this subject by the Church, there will be a tremendous deterioration in the department of religious teaching. It is well worth considering whether a system of Church certificates may not take the place of the Governmental papers—whether we may not in that way secure even a better religious teaching—whether, in point of fact, a sterling and general religious tone may not pervade the teaching in our schools by furnishing the teachers with religious certificates given in some form or other by the Church, without which, I fear, we shall lose altogether the effect of the papers hitherto given by the Government Inspectors.

His Lordship then pronounced the Benediction, and the sitting terminated.

WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON, 12th OCTOBER.

The Right Rev. the President took his seat at 2 o'clock.

LAY REPRESENTATION IN CHURCH SYNODS AND CONFERENCES.

The Right Rev. the BISHOP OF SALISBURY read the following paper:—

NO subject of Church Interest has come so rapidly to the front as that on which I am desired to speak a few words to you to-day—the Part of the Laity in Church Synods or Congresses. The subject is so large, and the time allowed to me so short, that I must lose no time in preliminary matters, but proceed at once to the subject.

Briefly, then, I hold, and am prepared to argue, that the Lay People ought to have a clear and proportionate part in such assemblies. I argue this first, theoretically :—If the Church of God at large be, as I believe it to be, the true Inheritor of the Powers given by the Lord through the Holy Ghost at Pentecost, then, whatever variety of position and corresponding degrees of weight there may be in the separate classes of men who compose the Church, none can be conceived to be absolutely excluded from all share in the exercise of those powers.

This principle, thus broadly laid down, does not by any means exclude the existence of a succession of men divinely empowered to exercise certain functions within the Church—those, I mean, of the Priesthood. I will not attempt to argue these points. I must be satisfied now to refer to the arguments which I have already offered in the Bampton Lectures for 1868.

The Powers of the Universal Church I attribute to the descent of the Holy Spirit on the Day of Pentecost; the special functions of the Priesthood I refer to the Breath of Christ breathed upon the Apostles as recorded in the 20th of St. John.

Observe—powers are one thing, functions are another. The powers are diffused; they exist in the entire Body: the well-being of the whole is requisite for the perfection of every part. The functions of which I speak are special, definite, matters of separate gift; requiring, indeed, the healthful support of the whole Body for their full efficacy, but owing their peculiar force to the special grace determined to the holders of them by distinct and personal gift.

The Powers direct the functions. They cannot create them, nor supply them if they be wanting, nor furnish any adequate equivalent for them if they be lost: but they can guide their exercise, appoint their sphere, limit their operation, in many ways direct and control them. The analogy of the human body to the Church of Christ, so often alleged and pressed with such minute particulars by St. Paul, supplies the precise illustration which the case requires. The Powers are those of the entire Body, the whole strength and well-being of which is necessary to the perfection of every part; the Priestly functions are as those of separate organs (such as of seeing or hearing) determined to their own objects, incapable of being supplemented by the general bodily powers, but under the control of the general Body working in the governing Brain, as to the mode and time and circumstances of their use.

I will dwell no further on the theory. To the whole Body, the Church, I attribute the supreme power in every generation to deal with all the emergent circumstances, whatever they be, which require direction and government: to the special organs, that is, the Priesthood, I attribute that special gift of the Holy Ghost which gives to them authority to remit and retain sins, with all the details of privilege and power which that awful, because supernatural, authority involves. Councils, Synods, and the like, are matters which belong to the Body and its Powers, not to the organ with its peculiar functions.

I turn to the History.—Passing by the first fourteen Chapters of the Acts of the Apostles, and merely noticing the election of St. Matthias and the seven Deacons by the whole Church, I come to the well-worn story of the Council of Jerusalem.

The Missionary Apostles, sent to consult the Apostles and Elders, were received on their arrival by the Church and the Apostles and the Elders. The Apostles and the Elders came together for consultation. The whole multitude were present. After much disputing—the debate testifying fully to the presence and participation in counsel of others besides the Apostles—it pleased the Apostles and the Elders, *together with the whole Church*, to send letters. Now, considering that these letters were the result of the pleasure of the Apostles and the Elders, together with the whole Church, it would not be otherwise than reasonable that they should run in the name of the Apostles, the Elders, and the whole Church. However, as you well know, the most ancient MSS. read the words in the form οἱ ἀπόστολοι, καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ἀδελφοὶ, instead of καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ according to the greater number of less ancient codices. Now one word only on the reading. If the words [καὶ οἱ] are a later interpolation (which is really very difficult to believe, considering the gradual increase of sacerdotal power), and the true reading is that of the Sinaitic, Vatican, and Alexandrian MSS. [καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ἀδελφοὶ], I submit that it is against Scriptural usage to regard the word ἀδελφοὶ otherwise than as the substantive of the article, and as qualified by the *adjective* πρεσβύτεροι. Besides, if it be taken as standing alone, and in opposition to the preceding words (which is, I apprehend, the view of those who insist most on this reading as one of great importance), it really has no meaning at all; for the Apostles and Elders (meaning by Elders, Priests) were 'brethren' of course, and the addition of that word becomes unintelligible. 'Brethren' is merely the equivalent of 'Christian.' But who could think that the letter would run in the name of the Apostles and Elders, Christians? If on the other hand it is regarded as the substantive of the article οἱ [οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ἀδελφοὶ] the word πρεσβύτεροι loses its substantival and secondary meaning, and the letter goes forth in the name of the Apostles and the Elder Brethren, and thus the whole argumentative force of the altered reading is lost.

I will not take up time by going over ground already abundantly traversed, except to allude in the most cursory way to the process of the exclusion and re-admission of the incestuous man, as we gather them from the two Epistles to the Corinthians, and to the language of St. Paul to the Galatians as to the Gospel which they had received, as well as that which he had preached, and to that of St. John, where, in his First Epistle, he says that "the anointing which ye have received of Him abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you, but as the same anointing teacheth you of all things, and is truth, and is no lie, and even as it hath taught you, ye shall abide in Him." All this seems to show, both in words and actions, the general truth that I desire to establish, that in the times of the Apostles themselves, undoubted as was the Apostolic authority of the fourteen, and clear as is the record of their ordination of others to the special Priestly functions, yet there was distinct recognition of that which I speak of—a diffused authority, springing from that anointing of which St. John speaks, which while it fully recognised the special Priestly functions, gave them support in various ways, took part in the selection of the men who were to discharge them, and with a great harmony that excluded none, operated in all the ways that were requisite for the well-being of the Body of Christ, the Church which He had built upon Himself, and enlightened with the anointing of the Holy Spirit of Promise. I would remark, however, in passing, that the Presbyters or Elders whom St. Paul ordained in every city, and whom he speaks of having been made by the Holy Ghost ἐπίσκοποι of the flock, to feed the Church of God which He had purchased with His own blood, were, we cannot doubt, selected as the chief and leading members of the body of the Christian Converts in the several places he visited. We cannot doubt that, as he passed from city to city, and gathered round him those whose hearts the Lord opened to listen to the doctrines he taught, he would generally choose for ordination to the Presbyterate the men of most character and weight—not youths but Elders—the men whose earnestness and influence for good, whose Christian wisdom and understanding he felt that he could best trust. I make this observation with a view to suggest that the "Elders" of the Apostolic age, though undoubtedly the predecessors of the "Priests" of the later Church, probably had (besides this Priestly office) a position in their respective cities, in point both of age and personal weight, to a part of which, at least, many a godly Layman of ripe experience, of holy life, and of well-proved faith may have succeeded. The young Priest, ordained at twenty-four, inherits, no doubt, all that special gift which, derived from the breath of Christ, empowers him to exercise the awful functions which belong to the power of remitting and retaining sins; but the Apostolic Elder had that too, and something besides, and in that "something besides" may perhaps be found some of the ground of that special weight in council which we find attributed to him. From the Council of Jerusalem to those of Carthage under Cyprian, the particulars recorded are too scanty to warrant any certain conclusions; but I venture to say that, such as they are, they by no means exclude the idea that the Lay influence was very considerable,—in writings, in the election of Bishops, and in their assenting presence in Councils: while the doctrine and practice of Cyprian in respect of the *Plebs Christiana* is too well known to require comment.

I, of course, cannot pretend to urge that in the long course of Councils of which we have definite historical accounts, from Carthage to Trent, Laymen have been allowed to take any regular or authorized part whatever; but I do argue that indications of what has been well called the mind of the Church in the earliest times, and various, though gradually disappearing, traces of the same mind in later times, show what it is my main point to press: namely, that the great powers of Pentecost,—such powers as those of knowing the Truth, governing the Church, electing its Bishops,—were not so confined to the Clerical portion of the Church as absolutely to exclude the Lay Members of the same Spirit-bearing Body from a proportionate (I do not say how great, or how small, but proportionate) part of the same powers. No power is greater—nay, I may say, none is so great, as that of judging of the Revealed Truth; and yet the generally acknowledged doctrine that no decisions are to be regarded as œcumenical and of absolute force until the whole diffusive Church has recognised them, plainly gives to the Lay part of the Church some part in the ultimate recognition. And if this be so, then (to borrow a remark of Mr. Keble's that I have already quoted elsewhere) it is only a question of Christian wisdom and prudence to determine at what point that Lay recognition be asked for.

I would also observe that all writers, even those who are most opposed to my conclusions, admit the presence of Lay people, as *consenting*, though they refuse to grant that they had any consultative voice in Councils. But do they realize the full meaning of the power of consenting? Does it not involve the power of dissenting? And what if the *stantes laici* all dissented? Will they argue that the decrees were equally binding and authoritative, in spite of such dissent? To my mind the right of assent seems very little distinguishable from that of taking part in counsel, though it may be understood to exclude the right of origination.

Before I leave the point of History, I would observe that while Lay people have been gradually excluded more and more from all acknowledged power in the government of the Church in sacred things, the whole history of the Church testifies most loudly that in all sorts of indirect and more or less illegitimate ways the Lay power has been at least as great as any person could possibly wish it to be, probably much greater, only irregularly exercised, and in the way of usurpation, and so to say, tyranny. The exterior union of Church and State in Europe has had the effect, perhaps not unnaturally, of dividing the Clerical and Lay elements withinside of the exterior union. Each has driven the other, and been driven itself, into the maintenance of claims more or less incompatible with each other. Meanwhile the Lay element has held its own, but in all sorts of irregular ways. It has been felt in the department of doctrine,—witness Mr. Ffoulkes's first pamphlet on the introduction of the word *Filioque* into the Creed. It has been seen in the long conflict of the secular and spiritual pretensions in Italy and Germany, ending in the gradual emancipation of all the nations (except, I suppose, the Leonine City!) from full submission to the Priestly claims of Rome; and in the struggles of successive Archbishops of Canterbury against the Norman and Plantagenet kings, until by degrees State authority, wielded by Tudor hands, has gained a supremacy which the Church has always fretted at and disallowed in theory, while it has been compelled to submit to it in practice. It is seen to this day in the never-ending conflict of incompatible claims,—the overruling authority of Parliament and State courts on the one hand, and on the other the claim to hold fast the primitive doctrine and usage whatever State authority may say, and what has been called the autocracy of the Clergy in their own Parishes. All this appears to me to be the not unnatural consequence of the ignoring of the diffused powers of the whole Spirit-bearing Body of Christ, and by consequence of the real relation borne by the Clerical and Lay portions of it to one another. Both real, both sacred, both having true place in the body, it cannot have been the will of the Lord of the Church that they should thus be in continual, and, as it might seem, essential antagonism to one another. Nor need they be so, so far as we may judge. The powers of the Body and the functions of the Clergy are things perfectly intelligible and distinct; and if the conspiring union of all be obtained by the due and joint exercise of the Powers, there would surely be little cause to fear the continuance of that war between the Clerical and the Lay which has, I verily believe, been the chief cause of the comparatively imperfect progress which has been made in the Evangelization of the world.

But time presses; and I must pass altogether from the province of theory and history.

Assuming then, that Lay people ought to have some place in Synods and Councils, I ask—*what place?* And how should their true rights be guarded, so as not to interfere with other rights certainly not less sacred than theirs, and much more plainly recognised in the long annals of the Church?

We have before us the American experience, now near ninety years old. It was in 1784 that for the first time, it is believed, in the history of the Church, Laymen took their seats in the Convention of the State of Maryland. We have the seventeen years' experience of the Province of New Zealand. We have the conclusions of the Pan-Anglican Synod. We have the earnest debates and the sketched constitution of the disestablished Church of Ireland. We have the tentative schemes of several Colonial Dioceses, and the views of several Conferences in the Dioceses of England.

It is agreed on all hands that the Lay members of the Synods must be representative. But what is to be the qualification of a Representative, and what of an Elector? It is plain at the first mention of the question, that till we get a more perfect system of discipline we cannot get a perfect representation. If it be said, none shall be an Elector except such as are *bonâ fide* Members of the Church of England, and none shall be a Representative unless he be a Communicant,—what, then, constitutes a *bonâ fide* Member of the Church of England, and what constitutes a Communicant?

Perhaps for the present, and in our present state, it may suffice to say that a man of full age who has been baptized in the Church of England, or, if baptized in Dissent, has been confirmed in the Church of England, and in writing declares himself a *bonâ fide* Member of it, may be acknowledged to be an Elector. I earnestly hope that the Lay Representatives may be strictly and merely Representatives; men, I mean, freely chosen by their brethren, and not taken into council merely from their social rank or station. Men of such rank and station, if freely chosen Representatives, will, no doubt, contribute much weight in council, but it would seem to me to be fatal to the permanent constitution of Councils if they entered into them in any other way. The qualification of a Representative in the American Church is that he be a Communicant, resident in the Diocese, under the cure of a Rector or Minister, in good standing, and not under Ecclesiastical censure. (*Dr. Vinton*, pp. 91, 103.) I do not find that the American Church defines what constitutes a Communicant,—I mean as to the time within which he has communicated.

I must not attempt to go beyond the precise subject proposed to me, of the representation of the Laity in Synods, or I would fain consider some of the many other points connected with the constitution of Synods,—such as the representation of the Clergy, the *numbers* of Clerical and Lay Representatives respectively, the position of Bishops, the vote by orders and the like. All these practical, and by no means easy, matters I pass by entirely; and only wish to notice, in conclusion, the two main objections which are commonly alleged against the admission of the Laity into Synods.

The first is the obvious one, that it is a new thing, for that all Ecclesiastical antiquity, at least since the age of Constantine, witnesses against it. I cannot deny it. If the Mediæval system be final and conclusive, *cadit quæstio*, I have not another word to say. But I believe the Mediæval system to have been not identical with the Primitive practice. I find the exclusion of direct Lay influence to have been continually diminished under the gradually deepening Sacerdotalism of the middle ages. The mind of the early Church seems to recognise and welcome such influence. I believe it to have become indirect, illegitimate, and often tyrannical from no other cause than because it has been excluded from its own due, orderly, and legitimate share of power.

It is further urged that it is often the duty of the Church, in the defence of Revealed Truth, to condemn heretical and unsound teaching; and that if the Lay people are admitted to any considerable share in such matters, it will be very difficult, if not hopeless, to obtain their consent to such necessary condemnation. To which objection I have only this reply to offer. The Body of Christ, the Church of God, must be trusted. You must begin by obtaining a fair and real representation of the Church of God in all its parts; but when this is once fairly and really obtained, it would surely be unfaithful to doubt that the Holy Spirit of God will be with its counsels, whether they be affirmative or negative ones. Now, there is unfortunate jealousy between Clergy and Laity. There ought not to be any. You may reasonably reckon that a Communicant Representative will be a man of sober thought and well-tried judgment. I hope and believe that the aid of such would give weight and breadth of no slight value to Council or Synod. It has been found so where it has been tried. But the main answer is summed up in these brief words—"The body of Christ, the Church of God, fairly represented in all its parts, is to be trusted."

The Rev. J. Wayland Joyce, M.A., Rector of Burford, Shropshire, read the following paper:—

Introductory.—I. In approaching this discussion, in which the high honour has been conferred on me of being permitted to take part before this critical and highly educated assembly, it is needful at the outset to distinguish between two terms connected with the subject-matter of our present enquiry, which represent things wholly different; *i.e.*, between *Synods* and *Conventions*, or, to use a term recently applied to the last mentioned assemblies, *Church Conferences*. A Synod is one thing; a Convention is quite another. A Synod is an assembly of men in holy orders; a Convention is a mixed assembly of Clergy and Laity. Synods deal with the faith; Conventions deal with the temporal accidents of the Church. Synods deal with her inner and spiritual life; Conventions with her outer and visible life.

II. This broad distinction, underlying the whole structure of the Church's being, may be traced down from Apostolic times through every age of her subsequent history. And yet this distinction appears to have been of late insufficiently regarded; notably so in discussions which have recently taken place touching the Irish Church, in which I regret to say, and say it well nigh tearfully, that we have heard much more of plans for retaining, enlarging, and dispensing the goods of this world, than of any wholesome provisions suggested for the protection and maintenance of the Church's faith.

III. The distinction above alluded to would be wholly annihilated, if propositions should be carried out, which have of late been very widely disseminated and very energetically supported, for introducing Lay representation into Synods—that is to say, into Ecclesiastical assemblies charged with authority over matters of faith and doctrine.

Such a revolution in the constitution of Ecclesiastical Synods would neither accord—

I. With the fundamental principles of the Christian Church,—

II. Nor with the pattern of the model Apostolical Council of Jerusalem,—

III. Nor with the example of the primitive ages of Christianity,—

IV. Nor with the historical precedents of the Synods of the Church Universal,—

V. Nor with the uninterrupted practice of this National Church,—

VI. And, moreover, such a revolution in the constitution of Ecclesiastical Synods, if realized, would certainly entail results which cannot be contemplated without serious misgivings.

I. (1.) The fundamental principle of the Christian Church is that *the Faith should be taught from above, not from below.* From the first calling of the Twelve Apostles—from the sending forth of the Seventy, two by two—from the inspiration of the Saviour's breath on His chosen teachers on the evening of His Resurrection—from that Divine delegation, "As my Father hath sent Me, even so I send you"—from the final commission confided to them on the Galilæan mount, "Go ye and teach all nations," we are assured of this. The shepherds are to teach the Christian flock, not the flock the shepherds. The crystal stream of Divine Truth has ever flowed downwards from above, not upwards from below. This is the fundamental principle of the Church of Christ. Any attempt to invert it is as though one would strive to realize the poet's impossible vision—

> "Pronos relabi posse rivos."

Or, to view the attempt in another aspect, it is as though one would strive to demolish an edifice of our Lord's own building, and reconstruct the pyramid upon its apex.

(2.) And this fundamental principle of the Church governed her proceedings in the Apostolic age, insomuch that the assemblies then held for managing what may be termed the temporal accidents of the Church, and those held for authorizing definitions of Faith and Doctrine, were differently constituted.

(*a.*) Under the first head may be placed that assembly of about one hundred and twenty persons who nominated Joseph and Matthias for the Apostleship, giving forth their lots; and also that assembly of the multitude of disciples who chose the seven Deacons that the Apostles might appoint them over the "business" of the distribution of alms. These were assemblies composed of the ordained teachers of the Word, and of the multitude of the disciples united together, meeting in common deliberation on the Church's temporal interests; for no question of

Faith was here involved. These two assemblies were the models of Conventions, or assemblies of Clergy and Laity united.

(*b.*) But when questions of Faith and Doctrine arose, then the "Apostles and Elders"—and they only, the ordained teachers of the Word—met in deliberation. Under this head may be placed those two assemblies convened for the settlement of questions of Doctrine, as recorded in the fifteenth and twenty-first chapters of the Acts of the Apostles respectively. The first was the Apostolical Council of Jerusalem, when the Apostles and Elders met to define the Faith as regarded doubts which had arisen among the disciples at Antioch. The second was a Diocesan Synod of St. James and his Elders, who again entertained the same subjects, and ratified the decrees of the previous Council of Jerusalem. These two assemblies were the models of Synods, or assemblies composed exclusively of ordained teachers of the Word.

II. (1.) The Apostolical Council of Jerusalem has in every age of the Church been considered the true model for subsequent Synods. In accordance with that example our Provincial Synods, or, as we call them, Convocations, have been constituted,—Bishops and Presbyters meeting in council. And if we inquire into the history of that assembly, it will be found that the Lay brethren had no place in it with "voice and vote decisive." It was composed of Apostles and Elders, and of them only. This is plain from the Sacred Narrative. A difference on questions of Doctrine having arisen at Antioch, we read—First, that SS. Paul and Barnabas were sent to Jerusalem "unto the Apostles and Elders about this question," and only to them. Secondly, that "the Apostles and Elders came together for to consider of this matter," and only they. Thirdly, when the decrees of this Council are subsequently mentioned in the Sacred Text, they are represented as having been ordained by the "Apostles and Elders," and only by them. For when S. Paul journeyed with Silas, Holy Scripture distinctly assures us that "as they went through the cities, they delivered them the decrees for to keep, that were ordained by the Apostles and Elders which were at Jerusalem."

It has indeed been maintained that others besides the Apostles and Elders took an authoritative part in this Council, from the facts, (1) that "*all the multitude*," (2) that "*the whole Church*," are mentioned in the Sacred Narrative; and (3) that the names of "*the brethren*" are said to have been superscribed to the Encyclical Letter thence dispatched. But to these three averments it is sufficient to reply, (1) that all that is recorded of "*the multitude*" is that "*they kept silence and gave audience;*" (2) that all that is recorded of "*the whole Church*" is, that they joined with the Apostles and Elders in sending "*chosen*" messengers "*of their own company to Antioch*," which are very different things from exercising voice or vote decisive in Council; and (3) that the text which joins "*the brethren*" in the inscription of the Synodical Epistle is spurious, and does not occur in any of the best MSS. The words ["καὶ οἱ," "and the"] before the word "*brethren*," are an interpolation. They are not to be found in the "Codex Alexandrinus," nor in the "Codex Vaticanus," nor in the "Codex Ephraem Syri," nor in the "Codex Bezæ," nor in that more recent priceless discovery of Tischendorf, the "Codex Sinaiticus;" neither are they contained in the Vulgate, nor in the Armenian version, nor in the passage before us as quoted by Irenæus and Origen.

It may therefore be affirmed with considerable confidence, that the superscription of the Encyclical Letter of this Council of Jerusalem should be rendered thus :—" The Apostles and Elders Brethren send greeting, etc.; " and this grammatical construction, and use of the word " Brethren," as distinguishing Jews from Heathens, and Christians from Jews, is common in Scriptural writing. Instances may be found as follows:—Acts i. 16; ii. 29, 37; vii. 2; xiii. 15, 26, 38; xv. 7, 13; xxii. 1; xxiii. 1; xxviii. 17. Moreover S. Paul uses a similar expression (1 Cor. ix. 5) to signify a Christian woman. Assertions, consequently, which have been made, that it is against Scriptural usage to designate " Christian Elders " by the term " Elders Brethren," are quite unfounded. Thus the superscription to the Encyclical Letter of this model Church Assembly, when rightly rendered according to all the best MSS., confirms the belief that the Apostles and Elders, and they only, deliberated there with voice and vote decisive. For as we learn from other parts of the Sacred Narrative that SS. Paul and Barnabas were sent from Antioch about this question to the " Apostles and Elders," and only to them; that the " Apostles and Elders," and they only, came together for deliberation; and that the decrees ordained are said to be decrees of " the Apostles and Elders," and of them only (Acts xvi. 4), so from this passage now under consideration, when rightly rendered, we further learn that the names of the "Apostles and Elders," and theirs only, were superscribed to the Encyclical Letter despatched from the model Apostolical Council of Jerusalem. And this being so, the expression contained in the Encyclical Letter—" *It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us*," etc., is referable to the Apostles and Elders and to them only.

(2.) It is certain that the practice of the Church universal in every age has been founded on the belief that this model Council was composed exclusively of the Apostles and Elders, *i.e.*, of the teachers of the Word, and of them alone. Such has been the conclusion of all the most learned Ecclesiastical writers; and to it our own most eminent divines, as Bilson, and Hammond, and Brett, and Potter, and Jeremy Taylor, have borne their emphatic testimony when treating of this assembly. "I remember," says Jeremy Taylor, when writing of this Council of Jerusalem, "that this place is pretended for the people's power of voicing in Councils. It is," he adds, " a pretty pageant, only that it is against the Catholic practice of the Church—against the exigence of Scripture, which bids us require the law at the mouth of our Spiritual rulers—against the gravity of such assemblies, for it would force them to be tumultuous and, at the best, are the worst of sanctions, as being issues of popularity; and, to sum up all, it is no way authorized by this first copy of Christian Councils."

III. In the Primitive ages of Christianity, which intervened between the date of the Apostolical Council of Jerusalem and of the union of Church and State under Constantine, this principle of restraining questions of Faith to the arbitration of the ordained Ministers of the Word was rigidly and uninterruptedly maintained. During that period we have records, more or less detailed, of at least twenty-two Synodical assemblies. But not a hint can be discovered, in the historical narratives of any one of them, of Laymen being introduced with voice or vote decisive. On the contrary, it is manifest that the constituent members of them were always ordained Ministers of the Word. It has indeed been affirmed that from Cyprian's writings it may be gathered that Laymen were, during his Episcopate, admitted to Synods in Africa with voices decisive. But the expressions in Cyprian's Epistles, which have led to this erroneous conclusion, refer to trials of the lapsed and questions of matter of fact in which Laymen would be most competent witnesses. Moreover, if Cyprian's Epistles are duly studied in their integrity, sufficient evidence may be found to prove that in his age Synods were composed of ordained persons only.

IV. Historical Precedents of the Synods of the Church Universal may be clearly traced, as we arrive at the era which witnessed the Convocation of the Œcumenical Councils, when the narratives of Ecclesiastical history become more explicit and distinct. And throughout the whole of that time the most emphatic and irrefragable proofs abound that the Laity had not, on questions of Doctrine, voice or vote decisive in Synods. Those proofs crowd upon our notice to such an extent, that time would fail to supply now even the barest epitome of them. However, as the interests of the Ecclesiastical historian cluster around the centres of the Œcumenical Councils, one instance shall be taken as a sample from the circumstances connected with each of those assemblies; and one only out of that imposing array of instances which present themselves.

(*a.*) The whole history of the Council of Nicæa, and the appended subscriptions, prove beyond all question that the judgment of that Synod was the judgment of Bishops only, the very words of Constantine in reference to it being as follows:—"That which has seemed good to the (300) Bishops is nothing else than God's sentence." To the strange averment lately made in some quarters, that Constantine himself personally intervened there in questions of Faith, it is sufficient to answer that he was not at the time a Christian at all, not having been baptized until nearly eleven years after the rising of the Council.

(*b.*) The second Œcumenical Council was held under the Imperatorial sway of Theodosius the Great, who expressed himself in the following words: "It is not lawful for a man who has not the Episcopal character to interpose in religious affairs."

(*c.*) The third Œcumenical Council was held when Theodosius II. and Valentinian III. were brother Emperors. To that assembly they despatched their Commissioner Candidianus, a Layman. But the following were the words of his commission, subscribed by their joint signatures. He was sent "Under this restriction and condition, that he should in no way whatsoever interfere with questions and controversies concerning dogmas of Faith. For it is impious in any man who is not enrolled in the most holy Bishops' list to mix himself up in Ecclesiastical business and discussions."

(*d.*) The fourth Œcumenical Council was held in the reign of the Emperor Marcian and the Empress Pulcheria. The Emperor addressed these words to the assembled Prelates: "Let the Truth be set forth by your expositions." And the Empress despatched an epistle to the assembly directing that, among others, "Laymen"—whom, she adds, "there is no reason to summon to a Synod"—should be dismissed from the city of Chalcedon, where the Council was held.

(*e.*) The fifth Œcumenical Council was held in the reign of Justinian. In his letter to that assembly he begins by asserting, that it has been the constant practice to repress heresy "by an assembly of Ecclesiastical

Prelates." And having referred to the impious writings then impeached, he concludes with these words: "We have called you together, and exhort you to declare your opinion upon the subject." And that he would never invoke a Layman's voice as decisive on such matters, we have the irrefragable evidence left in that Emperor's novels. This is his Imperatorial law touching Ecclesiastical differences: "We will that such causes be by no means entertained by Secular authorities, according to the sacred and Divine rules which our laws do not disdain to follow."

(*f.*) The sixth and last Œcumenical Council contributes the most conclusive testimony possible for summing up this chain of evidence. For it confirms it all most positively by a Canon of the Church Universal—the 64th of the Quinisext Code. These are its words: "It does not behove a layman to dispute in public, or to teach. . . . but to open his ear to those who have received the gift of teaching the Word, and to learn from them Divine truth." And there exist the gravest doubts whether any local Church can rightly assume the power of contravening in the constitution of her Synods a Canon of the Church Universal.

The foregoing are single specimens of evidence; one, and one only, in each case, being taken from the crowd of testimony which surrounds the history of the Œcumenical Councils.

V. By the uninterrupted practice of this National Church, her Synods have been hitherto constituted of the ordained teachers of the Word, and of them only. Her whole history bears witness to this truth, and the present constitution of her Convocations as an existing fact contributes its testimony. Confusion has indeed been introduced into some minds, and errors have been committed by some writers, from a failure to distinguish between the accounts of Synods, Wittenagemots, Great Councils, and Parliaments, which in our National records have been handed down together. But learned writers have been careful to observe these distinctions. Bishop White Kennett, a most curious searcher into antiquity, who had the advantage of the previous inquiries of Bilson, and Taylor, and Wake, and Brett, and Atterbury, thus writes on this subject:—"The Saxons kept to the due distinction of their Wittenagemot or Parliament, and their Circ-gemot, Haly-mot, or Synod. And though the Clergy were mixed in the former as common subjects and one state of the realm, yet in the latter they were alone and by themselves, as the peculiar officers and administrators of religion." And again:—"Laws . . . for the outward peace and temporal government of the Church . . . were properly ordained by the King and his Great Council of Clergy and Laity intermixt, as our Acts of Parliament are still made. But if there was any Doctrine to be tried, or an exercise of pure discipline to be re-formed, then the Clergy of the Great Council departed into a separate Synod, and there being the same men in a different and sole capacity, they acted as proper judges within the power of the keys."

VI. And now to speak of the results which would ensue from introducing Lay-representatives into Synods, with voice and vote decisive on questions of Faith. And here it should be premised that in this Church of England, being one of Provincial organization, ultimate authority in matters of Faith resides in her Provincial Synods, or, as we now term them, Convocations. For this assertion sufficient proof is afforded by the facts—1st, That the Canon of Scripture itself (the foundation of our Faith) as received by this Church—2ndly, That her Articles, a formal expression of Faith—and 3rdly, That her Prayer-Book, the manual of her public devotion—have all been primarily adopted in the most formal manner, and originally ratified under the most solemn sanctions by those assemblies. That is the fundamental authority (say what men will) on which our rule of Faith and our forms of Divine Service have been settled and accepted by the Church.

Now by the introduction of Laymen into such assemblies, the following results, among others, would ensue:—

(*a.*) First, on the Laity would be conferred authority to become preachers of the Word in the highest possible sense. For Synods define what individual preachers shall deliver as faith to the flock of Christ. And such Laymen as should have voice and vote decisive in those assemblies would thus become teachers of the preachers, and so preachers to themselves. And it is observable that by the 23rd Article of this Church of England, it is not lawful for any man to take upon himself this office, of preaching the Word: but only for those which "be chosen and called to this work by men who have public authority given to them . . . . to call and send Ministers into the Lord's Vineyard."

(*b.*) Secondly, the Lay vote—in the case of voting by orders, the plan almost universally commended—might be at variance with that of the Bishops and Presbyters. Let us contemplate the possible result of such a contingency. All Ecclesiastical history testifies to the fact that the Faith of the Church has been built up quite as much by the negation of Heresy as by the affirmation of Faith. If, then, a Heresy should be challenged for judgment, and, while the Episcopal and Presbyteral order should condemn it, the Lay order should refuse to assent to the condemnation, then as the consent of all three orders would be necessary to constitute a Synodical act, not only would the Heresy pass unrestrained, but it would be stamped on the Church, for such would be the effect of a Heresy delated and uncondemned. And all this against the decision of her Bishops and Presbyters.

(*c.*) Thirdly, the case of an offending Metropolitan, as affecting this question, must not be overlooked. Before the ninth century no Bishop could be tried for heresy or any Ecclesiastical offence in a Court at all, but only before his Comprovincial Bishops in Synod, as settled by the second Œcumenical Council. And, whatever may be the case as regards a Bishop now in England—into which it is not needful to enter—there is certainly no tribunal known either to the law of Church or State here to which the case of a Metropolitan ecclesiastically offending could be directly submitted save only to the Synod of his Province. No Diocesan Court is available—all such being Courts of inferior jurisdiction. The Provincial Court is not available, as being the Metropolitan's own Court; and he cannot be judge in his own cause. The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council is not available, as being only a statutable Court of Appeal in causes Ecclesiastical, and not one of first instance; and, in real truth, not being an Ecclesiastical tribunal at all. The only available tribunals in such cases are the Provincial Synods. And, should Lay representation be introduced into those assemblies, an event would become possible which has ever been most jealously guarded against in every age of the Church—that is to say, the subjection of the Doctrinal Faith of a Chief Pastor in the Christian flock to the arbitrament and judgment of the flock itself.

CONCLUSION.—The foregoing remarks have been confined exclusively to the Subject of Ecclesiastical Synods—assemblies charged with authority over Faith and doctrine,—and to the objections which exist against the introduction of Lay-representation into them. Those objections are drawn from a consideration: I. Of the Fundamental principles of the Christian Church; II. Of the model Apostolical Council of Jerusalem; III. Of the practice of the Primitive ages of Christianity; IV. Of the historical precedents of the Church Universal; V. Of the practice of this National Church; and VI. Of the results necessarily consequent on such a course.

To the researches of others I leave the inquiry into that most interesting subject—the proper organization and constitution of Church Conventions, in which Clergy and Laity may unite in loving brotherhood, and "take sweet counsel together" for regulating the temporal accidents of the Church, for strengthening her earthly position, and enlarging her visible borders. My desire is, on this occasion, to call attention to the broad distinction between Conventions and Synods—between the different powers, rights, and duties belonging to each—and between the separate domains within which the authority of each is exercised, coinciding as they do respectively with those two separate and distinct regions, the region of the Church's outer and visible life, and the region of her inner and spiritual life.

Within the latter region Synods in the Church are supreme. And to maintain their true character they must still be constituted in accordance with the fundamental principles of the Christian Church, on the Apostolic model, after the type of the first Council of Jerusalem, in accordance with Primitive antiquity, Historical precedent, and National practice. Such, let us be thankful, is the present constitution of the Synods of this Church of England—her Bishops and Presbyters united in Council. Under the broad shelter of her protection we, her sons, have hitherto defied the insidious and subtle advances of Mediæval corruptions, as well as the fiercer and more open assaults of modern Schism, and Infidelity. This Fortress of the Faith may we of this generation be faithful to deliver unimpaired to the guardianship of our children. This Fortress of the Faith may they again hand down in all integrity to generations yet unborn. As those in their turn receive the sacred charge, as they "walk about" their Zion—this ancient Church of England—as they "go round about her and tell the towers thereof," may they, too, be faithful to defend her with courage and with constancy to the end. And in the constitution of her Synods, the very centre of her life and being, may her children in every age, having regard to the example of the Apostolical Council of Jerusalem, be careful to maintain this Divine commendation inscribed indelibly on the forefront of their citadel,—

"Her foundations are upon the holy hills."

The Venerable ARCHDEACON UTTERTON, Surrey, read the following paper.

THE question before us is one of the great questions of the day, on the practical solution and issue of which depend, in God's providence, the interests—nay, in many respects, the permanence, of our Church in her present relations. "The Church of England," said a great authority at the Manchester Congress seven years since—Mr. Beresford Hope—"is in the throes of her second birth, and she will either come to life or not, according as she does or does not show a generous confidence in the people, and admit them or not to a share in her administration and responsibilities." Vast and momentous has been the progress of the Church, her fortunes and experiences, the vicissitudes and trials through which she has passed even since that period, and it would be easy alike to draw a gloomy and ominous, or a fair and promising, picture of her present condition and prospects. We might point, on the one hand, to the foes gathering without,—to the breaches made in her outworks,—to the mines ready to be sprung under her venerable Institutions,—to the divisions, the recklessness, the rashness of some,—to the bigotry and narrow-mindedness, the indifferentism, the latitudinarianism of others,—to the separation of classes,—to the physical and spiritual destitution of the masses, who are the weakness and the blot, but ought to be the strength and glory of a National Church,—as causes of sorrow, shame, and alarm.

On the other hand, we might point to the general interest awakened in Religion, to the zeal shown for the worship of God, and to the numerous Agencies for the promotion of Religious and Charitable objects,—yea, to such glorious heart-stirring and harmonious gatherings as the present,—all, we trust, tokens of God's presence with us and favour towards us.

Surely, under these—nay, under any circumstances, we are not to despair, or to relax our efforts for the good of our Zion, but should rather rally all our forces for her defence, while we conspire heartily and boldly to supply what is lacking, and to correct what is amiss in her. After all, what we want chiefly is wisdom to guide our zeal, and unity to concentrate our energies. For lack of these, not only is there a great waste of power, time, and means, but mischief is often done where good is intended. Those hinder who should help, or, at least, wish God-speed to each other, and the force which should be multiplied by concentration is diminished by distribution.

This wisdom and this unity are the choice gifts of God the Holy Ghost, and are to be sought by earnest prayer. But in humble dependence on Him we must use every means to attain them; and I know none more effectual than such brotherly Conference as this.

What we have been mainly suffering from is *isolation;* isolation of the Bishops from the Clergy and of the Clergy from the People. It is not for us now to dispute as to where the fault of this lay, but to acknowledge and deplore the fact, and to remedy it as best we can. Allow me but for a few minutes to enumerate some of the evils resulting from this state of things, and to show how they would be remedied by freer intercourse and more organized combination.

Bishops, then, have often missed that support with which—be a man never so good and great and wise—he cannot well dispense. Lord Bacon, in his "Pacification of the Church," has shown how undesirable it is that "a Bishop should proceed sole and unassisted," reminding us that "ab initio non fuit ita," and recommending a reform in this respect "sine strepitu,"—namely, by reviving those Councils of Deans, Chapters, and other Presbyters, by which he was originally surrounded.

The Clergy have had severally and alone to bear a burden of care and responsibility to which they were not equal. Discouraged and disheartened they have been for want of sympathy and counsel, distracted and over-borne by a multitude of duties, called to serve Tables when they should have given themselves to Prayer and to the Ministry of the Word. Hence their ministrations have lacked that depth and power and seriousness which can only be maintained by much Study and Devotion. On the other hand, the Laity have been denied the privileges to which they were entitled, and lacked the personal benefit and delight which they would have found in supplementing the labours, sharing the cares of their Pastor, and discharging those ministrations for which they have gifts. Thus the Spiritual Body has been cramped, the healthy life and action of its members being repressed. Moreover, as the Laity were only invited to find the means for carrying out what the Clergy originated and executed, they naturally have not felt the interest they would, if they had been taken into counsel and co-operation.

It has been truly and wisely said that no work, be it what it may, is ever heartily done when those who ought to do the work have not some say in its management; that you will get more work out of men, and better work too, exactly in proportion as you take them frankly and freely into your counsels, and as they find their advice is fairly and honestly considered. If we, the Clergy, want the Laity to work with us, we must ask them to consult with us. Till the Laity are thus associated with the Clergy, the Church may have *the mind* to do many things, but she will have the power to do none.

Again, their habits of business and knowledge of the world, their practical wisdom and power of administration, the personal influence of the Laity on their fellow-Laymen,—all these have been lost to the Church, while a feeling of shyness and restraint, and too often of jealousy and suspicion, has been growing up between them and the Clergy.

Moreover, this state of things occurs when men will, and are competent to, think for themselves, as they could not, nor were disposed to do, in ages when learning and knowledge of every kind were almost confined to the Clergy. Now-a-days, many of the Laity are often as well acquainted with the subjects of controversy as those to whom they are called to submit themselves. We cannot afford to lose the counsel of such men; and, indeed, unless we carry their support and consent with us, we shall not long maintain our authority. In the present day, indeed, no ruling power can last which does not approve its conduct to the judgment, and carry the good-will, of the governed. Blind and dumb obedience is gone for ever. Men will look, and judge, and speak for themselves. It is a received axiom that in all human legislation men should somehow or another have a voice in enacting those laws by which they are to be governed. It is alike the duty and interest of those in authority to afford constitutional and legitimate opportunities for this. If we preclude them from this from fear of results, those results will come upon us in a worse form; their voice will be heard through other organs and in other ways. Whereas, if we invite what we cannot ultimately prevent, we shall find, nay, we have already found, the blessed reward of it.

As a matter of fact the improved state of things for which I am pleading is being happily and safely brought about by sheer force of circumstances.

All of us who work our Parishes with any zeal, method, and judgment, are associating with ourselves good and kind helpers both in counsel and action, in matters spiritual as well as temporal. There are few Ruridecanal Chapters to which the presence of some of these is not occasionally invited, and that to the great benefit and satisfaction of all present. The heretofore formal Archidiaconal Gatherings, for presentations, and for payment of disputed Fees, are now in many parts enlivened, not only by the social meal, but by free and hearty discussions, both of Clergy and Laity. Our great Diocesan and National Societies for Church Extension both at home and abroad,—what are they practically in their Committees, but Conferences of Laity and Clergy, from which arise the happiest results, not only of a direct but incidental character, tending, as they do, to stimulate and unite us all, and preparing the way for a more formal Organization which has already developed itself in a few Dioceses, and will doubtless spread throughout all in due time? Happily it is unnecessary for me to show, as I might, from the Acts of the holy Apostles, the voice of the early Christian Fathers, nay, even from the practice of the Church of Rome in her purer days, and from the history of our own Church in England, both before and after the Reformation, the legitimacy and propriety of such an arrangement as that by which Laymen of good repute may, if not by election, and forming a constituent part of the Synod, yet have the privilege of being present and giving both their counsel and consent in matters submitted to them by the Fathers of the Church. Thus did the first Sacred Synod at Jerusalem issue its first decree in the name of the Apostles, and Elders, and Brethren. In our own British Church we find the chief Laity and People gathered from all parts of Wales to join with the Bishop and his Clergy in condemning the Pelagian Heresy. Indeed, Diocesan Synods formed a most important feature of the Anglo-Saxon Church, and were attended by Clergy and a select number of Laymen. Hence perhaps our Sidesmen or Synodales men. It is clearly evident, indeed, from the testimony of Ecclesiastical writers at various epochs, that the Lay element in Synods was recognised as legitimate.

In the ninth Century, Pope Nicholas I. contended that Laymen might be present where the Faith, which is common to all, and pertains not only to the Clergy but also to the Laity and to all Christians generally, is treated of. In the tenth Century, Burchard, Bishop of Worms, speaking of a Diocesan Synod, after describing the order in which Presbyters and Deacons should sit, says, "Let some Laymen also of good conversation be brought in, and then let the Bishop enter, who, entering into the Synod, is first to salute the Clergy *and People.*" And in the 13th Century, Innocentius III.—whom Gibbon characterizes as a young and ambitious Priest, in whom the successors of St. Peter attained the full meridian of their greatness, and as one who exercised a despotic command over Emperors, Kings, and Nations—even he says, "as the Laity should not hinder the Clergy's jurisdiction, so neither is it reason that the Laity's rights should be abridged by the Clergy." And our own illustrious countryman, William Occam, the invincible

Doctor, the great Schoolman of the 14th Century, lays it down on this point as an indispensable rule, "Quod omnes tangit, ab omnibus tractari debet;" and we all know how strongly the judicious Hooker speaks to the same effect. What we want now, is a practical revival of this custom, with such modifications and changes as may be demanded by altered circumstances and the exigencies of the times. There ought, in fact, to be a series of Church Deliberative Assemblies varying from the lowest—that of the Parish—up to the Central National Congress, in which the Laity shall have their places.

The practical conclusion at which I believe we are all arriving is this, that in the present state of the Church some organization is necessary which recognises the rightful position of the Laity. Such organization must not interfere with the union of Church and State. It need not interfere with the essentially Clerical character of Convocation, although that Convocation should present a more just and enlarged representation of the Clergy, and the Laity might have a voice in their election. Still, a Church, to be properly organized, must have an Assembly, wherein its representatives, Lay and Clerical, may meet for the discussion of those matters which affect the efficiency and vitality of the whole Body. This principle is recognised in the Greek Church, in all foreign Reformed Churches, and in the American Church. Even among our own Nonconformists we see a Synod of Presbyterians, a Conference of Wesleyans, a Union of Congregationalists, while the Church of England alone—now that the House of Commons, alas! has ceased to be her Convention—has no recognised general Organization hence we are crippled and hindered.

Without this there can be no restoration of godly discipline; no re-establishment of Church order; no settlement or accommodation of our disputes on matters of Faith, Church government, or Ritual; no adequate development of our resources for meeting the peculiar wants of the age; no adequate system of either Church Extension or Defence. There can be no true hearty concord among the Clergy themselves, or between the Clergy and Laity.

We are apt to boast of the present age as one of progress. Alas! alas! in our efforts to extend Christ's kingdom, to propagate the Gospel, to apply its healing virtue to the ills of humanity, whether in its individual or corporate state, to develop the power and resources of the Church—alas! it is but little progress, after all, that we are making; and what is that progress (so-called) but a retrogade movement, the reseeking of the old paths which we had left, or at best the fetching up of lost way? We have but to study the picture of the Early Church, (notwithstanding its deep poverty and all its other difficulties and disadvantages) as presented to us in the Acts of the Apostles and in the Epistles of St. Paul, to see how miserably we fall short of our duty, our opportunities, our privileges, aye even in the development of Church principles and organization. We are just now, in the nineteenth century, disputing about the legitimacy, the mode, the propriety of doing that which was in full and vigorous action in the Apostolic days and the Primitive Christian Church. We gather from the New Testament that the whole body of the Disciples acted with the Apostles and Elders in *confirming decrees*, in nominating candidates for the several orders of the sacred Ministry, in sending out Evangelists, receiving the report of their work, judging offenders, and dispensing alms by the hands of its own elected Almoners. The word χειροτονηθεὶς so often applied to these acts, seems to establish this point. What are those incidental, but touching allusions of St. Paul, in Rom. xvi. and elsewhere, to his many fellow-labourers and helpers of the Laity, both men and women, but the lifting up of a hive and showing every bee at work? We are told that the Parochial system has broken down in our land and failed in its application to the masses of the people; but if so, why is this? Simply because we overweight our engines instead of multiplying them. One poor machine is tugging at a train to which it is utterly unequal. We are laying a stress upon it which it was not intended to bear; whereas, if we were to put on more locomotive power (by annexing a supplementary engine), the train would glide easily along. This power we have, if we would only use it, and would supplement Clerical by organized Lay Agency, both in counsel and co-operation. We define too sharply, or certainly separate too widely, the different Orders which were so nicely and so closely graduated in the Early Church. We forget such sayings as that of St. Chrysostom, ἔστι δὲ ὅπου οὐδέ διέστηκεν ὁ ἱερεύς τοῦ ἀρχομένου "that there are many matters in which there is no difference between the Laymen and those who are over them, and wherein they should concur and co-operate as equals," and how he warns us against throwing everything upon the Clergy; indeed, his whole Homily on this subject is most pertinent to our present circumstances and the discussion in which we are now engaged. 2 Cor. viii. 24. Hom.

Let us hope and pray that the result of our ventilating this and other subjects of like moment in this great Congress may not be the scattering the recollection of them to the four winds, but that the chaff—all that is irrelevant—being dissipated, some grains of truth may abide with us, take root, and fructify. Surely we can already see some good results of the gathering of honest and true-hearted men for Conference and Consultation—such results as have belied the gloomy predictions of some, and rebuked the distrust of others. The assembling of the Clergy in Convocation, in National Church Congresses, in Diocesan Synods, in Ruridecanal and Parochial Conferences, and the Association of the Laity in all these, except the first, has tended already to modify extreme opinions, to conciliate mutual respect and affection, to evoke and mature measures for the common good of our people, to inform and influence the Legislature, and to bring about that union which is strength, and which avails alike for the Defence as also for the Extension and Development of our Church. Indeed, amidst the lowering clouds which appeared to be enwrapping us, notwithstanding the fierce conflict of parties, and the absence of due order and discipline, the defiance of constituted authorities, the arbitrary and self-willed setting at naught of others' judgment and feelings, there has been this gleam of light, this harbinger of peace—viz., a growing Consensus of good and thoughtful men; proving all things, and holding fast that which is good; and public opinion, rocking to and fro under the agitation of Theological controversy and Ecclesiastical contests, is, we may hope, gradually settling down on a firm but broad basis of Truth and Soberness. It is a great crisis, indeed, through which we are passing in this respect,—one, which calls for special prayer, study, and self-restraint, together with straightforward openness and freedom of speech; and the issue of all this turmoil and conflict may, and, we trust, will, be such an intelligent, large-hearted, Catholic, and comprehensive harmony of sentiment and action as was never witnessed in the Church of Christ since the days of the Apostles.

I am no Optimist,—I am not looking out for a Millennial state before the Second Coming of our Blessed Lord,—but I do believe that out of the present apparently chaotic struggling of the elements of thought, and feeling, and activity, the Church of Christ in this land may yet present such an aspect as she never did before; that she will "look forth as the morning, fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners;" that she will wipe out the blots by which she is disfigured; that her weakness will become her strength, those members of her body which we think to be less honourable having more abundant honour bestowed upon them; that she, being true to her Lord and herself, will triumph over all enemies and obstacles, and will march onwards in the grand course to which she is especially called and fitted, and for which she has the noblest opportunities in the present day. But it is her great crisis; she is, perhaps once for all, on her trial; and in order to accomplish this great destiny, she must use all her resources. She must not lean on one arm of her service, to the neglect of others; nor think that any will avail, without all. She must wholly shake herself from the dust, and rouse all her members to action; having the same care for each, and recognising the claims and interdependence of one upon another.

The Laity must not set the sacred order of God's Ministers at naught; they must not despise, much less intrude themselves upon their especial Functions, neither must the Clergy seek to be Lords over God's Heritage, saying, "Listen and obey," exacting a blind and dumb submission, or denying the Laity that participation in the Counsels and Ministrations of the Church to which they were admitted even in the days of the inspired Apostles, in the pure and primitive Church, as they still are in every Reformed branch of it; and to which they are especially entitled by the Canons, Constitution, and arrangements of our Church; and for which, thank God, a vast number of them, by their high attainments in religious knowledge, by their piety, zeal, and practical wisdom, and by their love to our Church, are singularly fitted in the present day.

ADDRESS.

Sir Antonio Brady, said:—

It gives me great pleasure to follow the Venerable Archdeacon, rather than the gentleman of antique learning who preceded him. We live in the 19th, and not in the 14th or 15th Century, and, if we would serve our Church, must shape our course according to the events occurring around us. I will not go into details of Lay Organization, but rather into some general principles which, I think, should regulate it.

Much complaint has of late been made of the want of Lay help in the Church, but so far as I have read, or heard, no one has yet ventured to touch the real reasons which appear to me to have prevented Laymen from taking their full share in Church work. The mischief, I believe, lies at the root of our Ecclesiastical polity. The law gives the

Clergy freeholds in their Benefices (which enables them to defy both their Bishops and their flocks), while it gives the Laity no voice in Church Government, either in Parishes, Synods, or Convocation. The late Bishop Wigram appointed a Committee to report on "Lay Co-operation with the Clergy," and they did so in 1867, giving twelve heads of work, in which Laymen *might* take part. This report was drawn up from a Clerical point of view, and contains much that doubtless is very useful; and the greater part of the recommendations are in some degree carried out in most Parishes governed by able and zealous Clergymen endowed with common sense. But unfortunately it is not so in all Parishes, and, as the Committee very naïvely pointed out, the difficulty is, how to get Laymen to undertake this work. The reasons for this difficulty were not gone into by the Committee, and I venture to state, that in slavish subordination to the Clergyman, volunteers for Church work will never be found, unless in exceptional cases.

With the first recommendation of the late Bishop Wigram's Committee I cordially agree, viz.—"that it will be for the advantage of the Church that the Clergy should invite the increased co-operation of the Laity in their Parishes, in *spiritual* as well as in temporal matters; and that such co-operation will be greatly promoted if it shall receive the formal sanction of the Bishop of the Diocese." As if any Bishop could refuse such sanction! Now this is all very well, but it presupposes that every Clergyman is willing to do this,—but *quis custodes custodiet?* And permit me, my lord, to say that Laymen will never give willing and hearty service until they have a *legal* and *recognised* position in the Church. It is not sufficient that they be invited by their Pastor as a matter of favour to work in the Parish—what if this favour be refused or revoked? What I claim for the Laity, is a legal and recognised right to a certain measure of control in that which so nearly concerns their own welfare, and the good of the Church of which the Clergy are the Ministers.

Laymen in the 19th Century do not want to be told by any Ecclesiastical Committee that they may be allowed to collect money for charities, and in many instances never be even consulted on the objects for which collections are to be made, or as to the distribution of the same when collected. They do not want to be told that they *may* help to support the Schools, but perhaps be insulted by the appointment or discharge of the masters or mistresses against their judgment, or, in other words, solely at the will of the Clergyman. Again, they need not to be told that they may "distribute tracts in the streets at their bidding," or any such commonplace. It is childish, to say the least of it, and such recommendations will not save the Church.

It is not to be expected that Englishmen will blindly do the bidding of an autocratic irresponsible Priest, who, perhaps, on his first coming into his Living, has upset all the arrangements and teaching of his predecessor, and shocked the feelings, may be the prejudices, of his flock, by extreme views, either of Low Church, High Church, Broad Church, or No Church do-nothing principles.

Everyone owns that the aspect of the present time is very serious. The Church, as a National Church, is on its trial. A possible Disestablishment and Disendowment stares us in the face; and if we would not live in a fool's paradise till we see our much-loved Church destroyed, we must look at her defaults and dangers fairly and temperately.

Now the subject of this paper takes up one of the most serious questions of the day, and in my mind there is not a moment to lose in dealing with it.

How are the Laity to be induced to help to preserve to themselves and their children the blessings of a National Church? It is a well-known truism, that people take little interest in what is done *for* them. Let them share responsibility, and they will work with a will. Clearly, to interest the Laity, and identify them with the work of the Church, they must have some sphere in which to act, some recognised work to perform, and some *legal position assured* to them, beyond what they have now. The interest taken by Dissenters in the affairs of their Chapels is a proof of this. There is no lack of Lay energy amongst *them* to support their particular views. Let *us* try and create a similar Church feeling, and then there will be no lack of Lay help. Let not the Clergy be distrustful of the Laity—they are the strength of the Church. I have no wish to see the tyranny of congregations over Priests substituted for the tyranny of Priestcraft over people: yet some safeguards are required. The Laity have consciences and rights as well as the Clergy. They have no wish to interfere in "things Spiritual," further than to prevent *un*authorised changes in the mode of conducting the Public Service.

In large towns it is universally admitted that the Parochial system (so beautiful in theory) has failed, and that, practically, in many cases, it has almost ceased to exist. If a Clergyman in one Town Parish is distasteful to his flock, any of them who please can go to other Churches; and we find they do so, thus converting the Parochial into a Congregational system. But in the country it is still worse; for if, unhappily, a Clergyman is distasteful, incompetent from age or infirmity, or even immoral, there is often no redress, and the people are tempted to build Chapels, and otherwise swell the ranks of Dissent; and, in such a case, it is obvious that there will be little or no *Lay help*. The Freehold system secures the rights of the Clergy, but ignores the rights of the Laity.

To bring the matter home, I will reverse the picture, and assume, for the sake of argument, that the Church is disendowed and disestablished. What would be the position of Clergy and Laity in such a case? The tables would assuredly be turned. The Laity would then, as a body, have *too much* power; for all pecuniary support would have to come from them; and only the able and energetic, and those who minister to the popular taste, would get a living. To avert such a calamity, let the Church be wise in time, and give to every one of her children an interest in the maintenance of the Establishment, by giving them a share in the management of its affairs. Above all, make the Churches free, and give the Parishioners some voice, if not a veto, in the appointment of Parochial Clergy; and let the Patrons also learn that patronage is a sacred trust for the benefit of the Parishioners, and that the exclusive right to preach the Gospel, conferred by their appointment in Parishes, is a solemn charge, and not *property* to be bought and sold.

The autocracy of the Clergy, so conferred, must in some way be controlled, or the Laity, as a body, will take no interest in their work; and the Parochial Clergy must no longer, in any one single case, be permitted to defy the Bishop they have sworn to obey, or to outrage the feelings of their flock with impunity.

The interests of the Laity require consideration as much as those of the Clergy, and how to reconcile these interests is the problem to be solved. Probably this could best be settled by the abolition of the Ecclesiastical Courts, and the substitution of appeals to the Common Law Courts for the enforcement of the law of the Church, as well as of the law of the land. How to do this with the least danger to liberty is the difficulty.

If every Layman were to prosecute under the *penal* clauses of the Act of Uniformity, no Clergyman would be safe. What is wanted is, that discipline should be enforced by competent and duly constituted authority, and not be left to individual Bishops, and appeals to the Ecclesiastical Courts, which means simply "How not to do it." I would have a Representative Council for Church work in every Parish. The present Bishop of Rochester has caused a mixed Council, of twelve Clergy and twelve Laity, to be elected to assist him when necessary. This Council was elected by ballot, by, and from, the Representatives of the several Deaneries sent by the Parishes to the Diocesan Conference lately held at Stratford under his Lordship's presidency.

This is a great step towards Lay representation in regularly constituted Synods, or rather Conferences, and in Convocation. I think by getting Laymen under authority, by legal or other sanction, to work thus with the Clergy as Representatives of Parishes, the way would be prepared for the still further step of Lay representation in the higher organization of the Diocese and the Church. If Church work is to be done, Laymen must have an authorized place assigned them in the doing of it. Such are the plain sentiments of one whose desire has ever been to forward, as much as possible, the practical work and efficiency of the Church of his fathers.

The Rev. Berdmore Compton, M.A., Rector of St. Paul, Covent Garden, read the following :—

My Lord Bishop,—In discussing this question, I propose to advocate, under certain conditions, not only the representation *of* Laymen in Church Synods and Conferences, but representation *by* Laymen; and not only representation, but representation by election.

But in so doing I desire to repudiate some of the arguments commonly put forward in favour of this view; for nothing so much damages a sound conclusion, as unsound reasons in its favour. In the first place then, let us not lean upon assertions of the natural rights of the Laity. In the Church, arguments from nature are unsafe. The whole system of the Church is above and beyond nature—much of it actually contrary to nature. It is above and beyond nature, that a man should be born again. It is contrary to nature that the branch cut out of a wild olive tree should bear good fruit when grafted into a good stock.

Secondly, a claim of *right* is out of place in the Church. Our position as members of the body of Christ is one of free grace. Every one of us, down to the humblest infant who was baptized this morning, has most exalted privileges ; none of us, up to the most dignified Patriarch, has any rights. Rights are from below. Privileges are from above. Rights are founded upon a condition previous to admission. Privileges upon concession, contemporaneous with, or subsequent to, admission. And when Hooker is quoted as arguing on principles of "natural equity" that no man in the Church "can be bound by laws to which he hath not mediately or immediately given his assent," I should like to ask whether the same principle of so-called natural equity is to be applied to the analogous position of an infant adopted into a family! Is *he* not bound by family laws to which he hath given no sort of assent ? Nor is this a mere *verbal* distinction—it deeply affects the tone of the whole discussion; rights are claimed with a sense of self-assertion ; privileges, with a sense of grateful obligation. The true question before the Church is—Does our Divine Head intend the Laity to enjoy the privilege of taking active part in Church Councils? Clearly our first duty is to look in Holy Scripture for express direction on this point. But we look in vain. Scripture gives no express direction. Next, we turn to the practice of Apostles and Apostolic men. As soon as the distinction of Clergy and Laity was established, is there any trace of the admission of the Laity to Council, or of their exclusion from Council? Here we have a gleam of doubtful light, and that rather adverse to the admission of the Laity.—In the proceedings of the first of Church Councils, that recorded in the 15th Chapter of the Acts, admitting the doubtful reading of the 23rd verse, which seems to give "the brethren" an independent status, in the formal preamble of the decree; and having regard to the mention of the Church in the 22nd verse, not as a part of the tribunal by whom the determination was made, but as *associated with* it ; is it not the simple view of the matter, that the reference of the points in dispute being distinctly made to the Apostles and Elders, these persons, assembled in Council, and in the presence of the rest of the Church, discussed and adjudicated the reference, and finally announced their judgment in the name of the whole Church? Here, then, is representation *of* the Laity recognised, even in their presence, but not representation *by* the Laity—nor are the representatives of the Laity appointed by the Laity. And when we look farther down in the history of the Church, still less trace is there of Lay representation in any sense resembling our modern idea of it. In the chief inspired accounts of later Churches which have been vouchsafed to us, in the Epistles of St. Paul, it appears simply that St. Paul ruled the Churches under his guidance with absolute authority. There is not a hint of any power of legislation being reposed in any one, either Clergy or Laity. In the Pastoral Epistles, we look in vain for any directions to Timothy and Titus as to the organization of Synods. And later still, in post-Apostolic times, in mediæval times, though Emperors, Kings, and Lay-dignitaries often sat in Church Councils, it is nearer the truth to say that they did so, like "the brethren" in the Council of Jerusalem,—rather for the sake of publicity and dignity, than as co-ordinate members specially representing the Laity. Certainly we may say that they were present rather in a civil than in an ecclesiastical capacity.

My lord, in these days, it is futile to talk of admitting Laymen as representatives of our Laity, for the purpose of concurrence only, for the ratification and promulgation of the determinations of the Clerical members of Councils. In these days it is of little use to profess, like St. Cyprian, to do nothing without the *consensus plebis*, if their co-operation is to be thus limited and confined. Under such conditions our English Laity will probably prefer to continue represented by the Clergy, as they have been from the days of the Apostles.

But is it not wiser to face the question as it is now presented to us under the present circumstances of the Church? Is it for the manifest benefit of the Church, and therefore presumably according to the Will of our unseen Head, that Church Councils should *now* include Laymen, elected and deliberating as representatives of Lay feeling in the Church? Without pretending to produce a distinct direction or precedent for it, is not this an allowable modification of ancient practice? Provided the exclusive ministerial functions of the Priesthood are maintained intact, is not this variation in the constitution of Church Councils permissible under the authority of binding and loosing conferred by Our Lord on the representatives of His Church? Is it not (to use the words of our Book of Common Prayer) one of "those things in their own nature so far indifferent, and alterable, that upon weighty and important considerations, according to the various exigency of times and occasions, such changes and alterations should be made therein, as, to those that are in place of authority, should, from time to time, seem either necessary or expedient"?

And, irrespective of the great and worthy object of satisfying the longings of the Laity, now so plainly declared; irrespective of the manifest gain of ability and weight which their accession to a Church Council would confer on its proceedings (especially in financial matters); irrespective of the value of an unprofessional element in a deliberative body; irrespective of the wholesome effect of their presence and influence upon the Clerical members of the body; irrespective of the enormous impetus thus given to their own loving interest in their

Church; to take one only of the numerous reforms unattainable without this extension,—is it not hopeless to look for the chief desideratum of our day, the restoration of the Discipline of the Church among Clergy and Laity alike, under any other conditions?

But now for the other side of the question:—1st, If representatives of Lay Churchmen are to be elected as members of a Church Council, what is to be the qualification of the electors? Until some better definition of a Communicant Churchman can be found than that which would seem to have been devised in very scorn and insult to the Church, viz., every Englishman who is not excommunicate, be he unbaptized, or apostate, heretic, or infidel, this one difficulty seems a fatal bar to any general system of Church election.

Secondly, comes the danger of the gradual deterioration of Church Councils for want of important business. It is manifest that questions of doctrine at least need be rarely stirred,—the more rarely the better. And after the first glut of business which must succeed a long suspension of Synodal action, a state of things might be expected frequently to arise, like that which followed close upon the passing of the last Act of Uniformity; when Convocation entered upon nothing more important than the revision of a Grammar for the use of Schools. And when there is little to be done,—when a Council is assembled, not because it is wanted, but because it has been elected,—then it is not only very likely to do mischief, but will surely deteriorate in quality. Able, active men will not care to spend their time upon insignificant matters or fruitless discussion; they will gradually withdraw from an assembly which does not give adequate occupation to their powers, and they will be succeeded, as we so often see in Parochial representative bodies, by turbulent noisy partisans, whose object is to force themselves upon public notice, and to gratify their vanity at all hazards.

Thirdly, and most seriously of all. Where is the sufficient supply of Laymen to be the worthy representatives of the Laity?

No doubt every one is ready with a few illustrious names of men, whose devotion to the Church is unimpeachable, whose capacity for business is admirable. But how short is the list!

And when we look for recruits, where is the sufficient Theological learning of the Laity? I dread the evil consequences of drawing a hard line through a Council between the learned Clergy, and the unlearned Laity. And we need no further illustration of the deficiency of our Laity in this respect, than the list, given by the Bishop of Salisbury in his Bampton Lectures, of Laymen "who by their writings have contributed to the illustration and defence of Christian Truth." One is almost astounded at the poverty of Theological learning in a list so general as to include Izaak Walton, Addison, Southey, and Coleridge, which really contains but a single name worthy to be called a divine, of the last and present generation, that of Principal Macbride. And worse still than the want of Theological learning, is the want of personal insight into the Church's system. The Laity have so lately aroused themselves to an active and zealous share in the work of the Church, that, with the exception of Sunday School teaching, comparatively few of them can have arrived at that ripeness of experience in her work, which alone can qualify a man for useful deliberation upon it. There are, indeed, many proposals for the structure of mixed Church

Councils, which profess to meet these difficulties. We have plenty of what is expressively called constitution-mongering on this subject.

But, my lord, I desire rather to see our mixed Synods and their practice grow up *gradually* (though not so slowly), as our State legislatures and their practice have done. It is a formidable undertaking to begin *ab ovo*, as some of our Colonial Churches have done. It is a fearful danger, to be compelled, with scarce any preparation, to make a sudden plunge into the working of a new Constitution, as our brethren in Ireland have been obliged to do. It is perilous to lean heavily on a system of *Veto;* perilous, formally to exclude any part of a Council from any part of its business; perilous, to attempt to shut out by express enactment Lay members from Doctrinal questions, instead of trusting to their modesty and good sense to hold aloof from them, as the Lay members of the House of Lords leave the legal business to the Law-lords.

But let us begin at once to prepare for our mixed Synods. Let us have mixed *Conferences*, organized by local authorities, in which both Clergy and Laity may be educated as rapidly as possible for Synodal action. Practicable forms of election and representation will develop themselves best by trying them on a small scale, where mistakes are not ruinous. And above all, let our Laity prepare themselves both for Conferences and Synods, by cultivating, if not Theological learning, at least the experimental knowledge of active work in the Church. It is experience alone which will make their counsel useful—and experience is to be attained only by diligent and persevering work. Indeed their success in Church work, promising as it is, must advance. The time has perhaps arrived, when the tone of encouragement and compliment addressed to the zealous Laity must be purged from an element of flattery. It is almost necessary to declare the truism, that *every* enthusiastic Layman, who is anxious to preach, is not competent to do it,—that *every* Layman, with leisure and earnestness, is not necessarily a man of business, not necessarily a dispassionate judge of the relative importance of religious forms, not necessarily superior to the Clergyman in knowledge of physical science, or of human nature.

Let Laymen's work go on improving, and the zeal will increase; and the Clergy will be improved too, and all will be trained together.

Lastly, let our men, who desire to legislate for the Church, be as efficient in its practical departments as their sisters so often are in their special provinces. The daughters of our Church have herein set the example to her sons. Without trenching upon the exclusive Ministerial functions of the Clergy, let our brethren acquire surely and effectively that personal acquaintance with the needs of the Church, which is the sole foundation of practical wisdom in her administration, which alone will enable them to be, in Church Synods and Conferences, not mere safety-valves for the effervescence of undisciplined enthusiasm, but cautious, far-seeing counsellors, and invaluable Church-helpers.

DISCUSSION.

Sir JOHN AWDRY.

I STAND upon the ground that has been already laid down for me by the honoured Prelate who opened this discussion; and a great deal as to the matter of expediency has already been said, much better than I should have said it, by Archdeacon Utterton, so that very little remains for me to say. But first, I would say, and without fear of contradiction, that *de facto* the determination of the highest questions of doctrine belongs, by the existing constitution of the Church, to Parliament, to whom it appertains to adjudge what is Heresy, "with the assent of the Clergy in their convocation." It is so declared in the 36th section of the 1st Chap. of the first Year of Elizabeth, which determines the reconstitution of our Church on the reformed model after the reign of Queen Mary. That is the law under which the *Establishment* at least stands to this day. That statute, or a great part of it, was repealed, indeed, by the 16th of Charles I. It was repealed in order to get rid of the High Commission Court, which had to administer the law; but as to the declaration where the power existed, that declaration was the recital of a matter of fact; and the repeal of the enacting part of the law would not falsify that declaration, when it had been once authoritatively expressed by the legislature. Whether, therefore, such *ought to be* the Constitution of the Church or not, such *is* the constitution of our Established Church. But there is an evil in it; because it is unadapted to the present day, on account of the insufficiency of the Civil authority for the exercise of power of that kind. The Civil authority is represented by the Crown and Parliament. The Church authority, under the present state of affairs, requires to be in different hands: first, because the Civil authority is by no means exclusively in the hands of Churchmen; and secondly, because the functions are different, and therefore it becomes expedient that individual Churchmen should be admitted to the Councils of the Church properly so called, rather than that the external force of Civil authority should dictate in Ecclesiastical matters. I do not desire to see, however, in the local assemblies of the Church, nor in the purely Ecclesiastical assemblies, more power given to the laity than they have at present; but this I do desire—that the power which exists should be in respect of a definite authority, and thereby be coupled with the responsibility for forming and expressing a judgment in the exercise of such authority. Now the power is great enough, indeed. Is there any Clergyman here who does not know how the laity can thwart him, whether in spiritual or other parochial matters? The power exists; but it is sometimes exercised, and can any day be exercised, by the noisy, self-seeking popularity-hunter: it is very often exercised by the man who has a personal spite against the parson; whilst the quiet, humble man, who exercises his own intellect in Church matters to the extent to which his cultivation enables him to do it, but who nevertheless acts with due deference to that order which is more particularly conversant with these subjects,—that quiet, humble man is kept out of the field of action, even if he is invited, as a mere auxiliary sort of ecclesiastical volunteer, to take a part in Church Conferences. He is not one of the authorized body; and if he has any degree of humility, the chances are that he keeps back. I hope, however, I have a little humility, though at the present time I am coming forward to speak upon the subject. But I may say, that the great difficulty in my own neighbourhood is in finding laymen,—who must necessarily be good, honest Churchmen in reference to such matters,—willing to come forward and act for themselves. Is there any Clergyman, in any single Deanery represented here, who does not feel that there is a difficulty in getting a sufficient number of competent persons to act? Not because the intellect and activity of the laity of the present day are insufficient; but because, though they may be interested in Church matters, their intellect and activity are devoted exclusively to civil and kindred topics, inasmuch as they have really no authorized and constituted place in Church Councils. I have nothing more to say than this,—that I do not think more power, but more responsibility, is needed for the laity.

What I do ask is, that those who come forward in Church matters should be invested with more responsibility, resulting from a real authority, and consequently that the modest men, who are prepared to exercise authority well, should be invited to act, instead of the whole being left to unauthorized and self-seeking volunteers.

The Rev. JAMES MOORHOUSE, M.A., Vicar of St. James's, Paddington.

MY LORD,—I should not have ventured to come forward to say anything on the subject now before the Congress, if I had not something practical to contribute to the discussion. I was asked, when I came into the room, to come forward simply to tell the members of the Congress what has been done, in my own parish, to furnish that which has been advocated by various speakers this afternoon. Every layman who has spoken has desired to have, not more power, but more responsibility, for the laity. That is exactly my view; and as it was my view when I first went into my parish, I endeavoured to carry it into practice. I asked the laity, as far as I could give them responsibility, to allow me to do so. I asked a number of my friends to come together to consider what kind of laws should be adopted for a Church Association. We framed a set of rules. Then I called a meeting of the congregation. At that meeting it was agreed that the Association should consist of all parishioners living in my own district, or being members of my own congregation, who should write a declaration that they were members of the Church of England. That being the constitution of the Association, we then asked the Association to consider the laws which we had outlined, and to elect a Council to be representative of them; which they did, and elected twenty-five of the principal inhabitants, duly qualified, and also Communicants of the Church, to be members of the Church Council. The Council then met, and the great question at once arose—what were they to do? I thoroughly agree with the sentiment, that the difficulty is to find sufficiently important work to make it worth while for men of practical ability, whose time is most valuable to them, to come and do it. One thing at once suggested itself. It has fallen to the Clergy (chiefly, no doubt, because there was no one else to undertake the duty), to determine for what Societies collections should be made in the course of the year. This seems to be no essential part of a Clergyman's functions; and I saw nothing to forbid me giving to the Council the power of making this choice themselves. Of course, in the next place, I asked them to counsel me as to what additional work could be done in the parish, of a spiritual, educational, and practical character. I also asked them, as I proposed to change the hymn-book, to furnish me with their counsel on that matter. I told them, before they gave me their counsel upon any subject, that I should always defer to it. I am the president *ex officio* of the Council; and thus I preside at all its deliberations, and can furnish its members with any reasons for the course I think it right to adopt. I said therefore, "I shall always implicitly follow the advice of the Council, unless you ask me to do anything to which I conscientiously object." Thus they were made to feel a real responsibility for all their acts; and as a consequence I have found that the business brought before them has invariably secured their utmost attention and interest.

Now let me say a word or two as to the results of this movement. The members of the Council asked me at once to have two additional services—one for Sunday scholars on the Sunday, and another early in the morning, to which persons could come who were otherwise prevented from attending services at any other period of the day. They further gave emphasis to their advice, by adding—"If you will act upon our recommendation, we will give you another Curate to do the work." Thus they gave me at once a substantial token of the fact, that they felt the responsibility involved in the advice they tendered: the parish got the additional services, and the further advantage of the labours of an earnest and useful Curate.

The Council have also recommended other changes of an important and practical character. One thing, however, I would particularly specify as a gratifying circumstance—that they have begun to take an interest in Church work, which I venture to say they did not take before they had to consider the claims of the various societies requiring to be supported. Before intelligent men can come to a decision in such matters, they must know the objects of the several societies, what their work is, and how it has been carried on. We have in this way educated one another. They have advised me, and I them: and I hope I have been enabled to give them important information upon the general work of the Church.

Furthermore, they have thus been acquiring a knowledge of each other's views upon matters of a distinctively spiritual character. I venture to think that in many parishes, though our communicants know each other's opinions upon political and social matters, they do not know them upon the deepest and most vital concerns of their spiritual life; and if you can get them together, and induce an interchange of opinion upon the greatest and most momentous of all subjects that can engage their attention, you will be accomplishing that which may be productive of incalculable good, and quickening their interest in the work that lies before them, to such an extent as cannot fail to insure its being well and successfully done.

I know there may be some who are opposed to the plan I have shadowed out, for the particularly lay reason that by it the Clergyman ceases to become the object of their fault-finding; but I have found even this objection effectually disposed of by the successful working of the scheme. I remember that on one occasion a certain lady came to me and said: "I hear that you have got a Church Council. Well, don't you suppose that you won't be held responsible for all they do,—because you will." She was afraid she wouldn't have the Parson to find fault with on every occasion. She didn't like to exchange the favourite object of her censure for an impersonal Committee; and I said at once that I should take the whole responsibility, though she would know at the same time that I had no business whatever to bear it. Upon this she smiled, and went away; and from that time to the present that lady has never found fault with anything I have done.

The Rev. F. H. Cox, B.A., Hobart Town, Tasmania.

I SHOULD not presume to stand here, and to occupy the place of men better known and trusted, if it were not that I can perhaps throw some light upon this subject, derived from personal experience of a kind not possessed, it may be, by any one else in the room; for it so happens that I am one of the Clergy of a very distant Diocese, where a Church Synod has been in existence for twelve years, in the proceedings of which it has been my privilege to take a very interested part; and therefore I shall be very glad to describe the work of that body, including, as it does, the colonial element of Lay representation. Twelve years ago it was decided by the Bishop and Clergy of Tasmania—Laymen being taken into consultation—that the time was come for us to follow the example of our neighbours in New Zealand, and to establish some such body as had been working well there. With regard to its *name*, Mr. Joyce would say that we made a mistake, and ought to have called it a *Convention;* but (possibly because we preferred the Greek word to its Latin equivalent) we determined that it should be a *Diocesan Synod*. The Bishop, all Clergymen of the Diocese in the cure of souls, and representatives of the Laity being Communicants, were to be its essential elements. Each constituted a separate order; and no act or resolution could possibly be adopted by the general body without the consent of the three orders. With respect to the difficult question of qualification of Lay-members and their electors, it was decided by us in this way. We appealed to men's consciences; and every man, who, upon his conscience and honour, declared himself, in writing, to be *bonâ fide* a member of the Church of England, was allowed to be an elector; and every one who gave a written declaration of his being a Communicant of the Church of England was allowed to be qualified for election. One large class of subjects was excluded from our deliberations. We bound ourselves to hold intact the formularies of the Church; so that, supposing any one to introduce a motion tending to violate this fundamental law, it would be at once rejected by the president and the general body, as being absolutely inadmissible. But within these limits, there are, of course, many questions of a mixed character, sometimes touching even upon doctrine and ritual, that come before the Synod; and upon all such questions, the Lay member has the same right of speaking and voting as his neighbour, the Clergyman. The result of this is, that a body has been created possessing and commanding general confidence,—the position of the Church in the island has been greatly strengthened,—and the tendency of things, so far from being in a democratic direction, has been decidedly Conservative. Men have been drawn into our body holding the highest positions in the colony—members of the Legislature, the Chief Justice, the Attorney-General, and others, not chosen into the Synod because they were leading men, but because they were known to be intelligent and earnest Churchmen; men who would be willing to help us, and who have helped us most materially. The very throwing together of such men with the Clergy has helped the Clergy, and I believe our Clergy have helped them also. If they have had prejudices, these have been gradually overruled and have worked themselves out. Men have learned to understand and to trust one another far better than ever they could have done if they had not been so brought together in the Synod. Whenever questions touching matters of doctrine have come before it, the Laity have invariably shown the greatest desire to manifest a willing deference to the opinions of the Clergy. They have not been bound to do so; but they have done it freely and naturally. This system, which has worked so well in a small Colonial Diocese, might obviously be expected to work better still in a larger one. Two years ago it was my good fortune to be in Sydney, and I was enabled to watch the daily proceedings of the Synod of that Diocese. There, of course, because the community is a larger one, they had the opportunity of a selection of men better qualified in some respects than we could command; and there certainly it is the universal experience—and I am sure the metropolitan Bishop of Sydney would be the first to say so—that Laymen in Council have given the most valuable assistance. I am aware that this opinion is but a colonial opinion after all, and that those who hold and believe strongly that Laymen ought not to be admitted into Synods, will consider that we are all under a delusion—that we are going down a precipice, and disposed to think that the pace is a very fast one. But still I think that, on the whole, this sentiment would be overruled by men of calm and deliberate judgment—not prepossessed with a love for colonial doings, but who have the opportunity of looking into the matter and of thoroughly testing it. If I might be permitted to add an inference to this testimony of practical experience, it would be by asking—why should not a system which works well in a small Colonial Diocese, and better still in a larger one, why should not that system, *a fortiori*, work better still if tried in any of the Dioceses of England? There are many questions in an English Diocese in relation to which the services of Laymen would be specially valuable; and it seems very difficult to produce satisfactory reasons why the Laity should not be employed and trusted in matters of that kind. Dropping the argument from antiquity, upon which (as we have seen to-day) doctors differ, and looking at it simply on the grounds of reason and common sense, it does seem very hard to understand why Laymen should not be invited to assist in deliberations of such a character. We know what the sacred functions of the Clergy are. They are set apart for a great work; but why should that be taken to cover more than it was originally intended to cover? A Clergyman is called to the pastoral office and the cure of souls: but surely he is not thereby called exclusively to the work of Church Legislation; and I cannot possibly see why his should be the only order of men capable of dealing with such work.

A. J. B. Beresford Hope, Esq., M.P.

My Lord,—I had not intended to take any part in this discussion; but the reference made by the last speaker but one to parochial Councils, and the consideration that a measure bearing upon them had been before Parliament last session, and was only withdrawn with a promise that it would be brought before the House again, induce me to offer some few remarks upon that part of the subject. I have for many years observed, and often upheld, the necessity for some system of representative government in the Church, wherein, with due safeguards, the Laity should have a place. I will not, however, discuss the general subject now. The immediate question is the creation of Church Councils; and I think it is impossible not to see, in the first place, that parochial Councils are growing up; in the second place, that they are likely to grow up much more extensively; in the third place, that they ought to grow up much more extensively; and, in the fourth place, that they ought not to grow up under Act of Parliament. The Bill of my noble friend, Lord Sandon, was a very well-intentioned Bill. We all know what an earnest Churchman the promoter of that Bill is. Among his opinions this one has place—that a Church Council for the parish could only acquire force and validity by its being empowered to act and to decree through Queen, Lords, and Commons. Now, I think this is a very great mistake—and that it would be indeed a fatal error of judgment if the give and take principle, if the influence of mutual kindly feeling, and that weight of common opinion which is stronger than authority, should, in such a small body as any which can be organized within a single parish, be replaced by the hard and grinding authority of an Act of Parliament. It is impossible to have a parochial Council established by Act of Parliament without a Clause defining what a Churchman is, so as to define its constituency and its membership; and how many of you would like to trust Parliament to define what a Churchman is? The Parliament would have also to define the scope of its action, and we should probably find binding enactments, not merely upon questions of an administrative character, such as the management of the parochial Charities and the distribution of the Offertory—delicate as such considerations must always be—but upon those questions of worship which lead up directly and absolutely to points of doctrine. If you have your parochial Councils created by Act of Parliament, that Act necessarily creates one hard and fast authority upon matters of faith and of form in all our various parishes—town and country alike, with all their differing circumstances. You can only prevent this by organizing for yourselves quickly and effectually your own Church Councils—not upon one absolute rigid rule everywhere, but in each parish according to the circumstances of the case. Nothing is so deceptive as uniformity, merely for uniformity's sake. Thus, in some parishes it would be the height of folly to leave the power of nominating the members of the Council entirely in the hands of the Clergy, and equally unwise in others to give it exclusively to the laity. The true thing to do is, first to determine to bring the best and most pious minds together for the purpose, and then to settle, according to the conditions of the Parish, the best mode of carrying that out. A principal matter for consideration is the condition of our Town parishes. If there is one thing absolutely more certain than another, it is that the Congregational system has grown upon the Parochial system in the towns. I am not afraid to say that it is right that it should be so—it is right, considering how many and diverse are the minds of an urban population, and how varying the shades of opinion in each of them—and, consequently, how many-shaped are the distinctive phases in which truth presents itself, as different things variously impress different minds. I refer, of course, primarily to questions of worship. It is absolutely necessary, if the Church of England in our towns is to continue to be the National Church, that while the Parochial system should exist in town or in country for its own duties and its own legal responsibilities, the license of Congregational worship should be perfectly free, and that there should be a willing give and take between the different civic Clergymen and the members of their several flocks. This being granted, must not your Church Council in towns be a Congregational one, and not a Parochia one?

If Lord Sandon's Bill were to become law, every Clergyman in London might be controlled by a Council composed of men, not one half of whom were worshipping members of his flock. That would be tyranny towards the Clergyman, tyranny towards the worshippers, and would assuredly be productive of no real benefit to those who did not worship in the place, but who were invited to overrule those who did. Yet, unless you can get Parliament to recognise this fact, it is totally unfit to legislate upon the question. The Congregational system in our towns must be conceded in theory—it must be admitted in practice—so that each Council at each town Church should be Congregational, and not Parochial. In the country parishes the old-fashioned vestries might still form the best and the most naturally worked Council; but everywhere the clergy and the laity must bestir themselves to meet in Congress. They must create, by voluntary co-operation, their own Councils, and so speedily and so unanimously as to prevent the intervention in the matter of Parliament, an intervention which can be nothing but mischievous.

The Ven. ARCHDEACON CHURTON, Cleveland.

I ASK only for five minutes, which I suppose will be almost the winding-up of this interesting debate. I think that in the interesting things we have heard from some of the late speakers, they seem rather to have gone away from the main subject proposed in the title of this debate. First of all, as to laymen in Church Synods. Something was said by the first speakers more particularly on that subject; but they did not allude to what has taken place in our Convocations, both North and South. In the northern province of Convocation a Committee has been appointed to consider upon what terms and regulations the laity should be invited and elected to take a part in our constitutional Convocations. That has been since done also by the Convocation of the Southern province, and is a fact which I thought it was desirable should be mentioned, because I have no doubt the Secretaries both of the Northern and Southern Committees would be very glad of any hints as to the regulations and restrictions under which the laity should be invited to take their seat and part in the proceedings of Convocation. I have listened with much interest to what has been said in the course of this discussion, and particularly to the arguments of the Bishop of Salisbury, in which he alluded to his Bampton lectures, wherein he has treated this question very fully, and in a way that would make it very profitable for any who are interested in the subject to study. I should be disposed to say that the agency of the laity in Church Councils was continued to a later date than the Bishop of Salisbury seemed to allow. Therefore, of course, I totally dissent from our reverend friend who followed the Bishop of Salisbury. We evidently read history with different spectacles, and upon almost every point on which he spoke I have come to a different historical conclusion.

THOMAS CHAMBERS, Esq., Q.C., M.P., Common Serjeant.

I HAVE your Lordship's sanction for addressing this meeting; and after the paper which was read by the Rev. Mr. Joyce, I think I ought to have his permission also. (The Right Rev. President nodded a negative.) My lord consoles me by saying it is not necessary. As a layman I am speaking once again on this platform by request; and I desire to console those who differ from me and agree with Mr. Joyce, by a reference to the list of names in the programme of the proceedings. There I find those of the Rev. Chancellor Massingberd, the Rev. Dr. Hessey, the Rev. Gordon Calthrop, the Rev. Prebendary Humphry, the Rev. R. Meux Benson, the Rev. Emilius Bayley, the Rev. A. R. Ashwell, and the Rev. B. M. Cowie, before I find the name of a single layman. Then there is the name of my honourable friend who sits behind me (Mr. Beresford Hope, M.P).—(The President having intimated that this was an error, the speaker continued)—I am reading down one column, you know, and I think I am quite right; but taking the entire list, I find the names of thirty-three clergymen and of only thirteen laymen. I don't complain at all; but I say that those gentlemen who entertain the views which the Rev. Mr. Joyce has so ably advocated to-day, have in that respect what they would desire—a full representation, and a most able one, of the views of the clergy on these points. As regards Mr. Joyce's paper, however, I differ from him, not only historically, but also argumentatively, upon every point that he has touched: and I differ, too, from some of those who spoke afterwards, and who raised so many difficulties in the way of the introduction of lay influence and help in the Church. I have very little to say after the speech of the Rev. Mr. Moorhouse, whose statement of facts as they exist in his parish is an answer to all that has been urged against increased lay co-operation. It is the case over again of the educational difficulty, which no one ever actually encountered in any parish in England, but which has been heard of abundantly upon platforms and in parliament; and I do firmly believe that as regards lay help, the thing would be precisely the same, and that there would be no difficulty in securing it whatever, if our clergymen would only do as Mr. Moorhouse has done—call upon the people to come and take their share in the labours and responsibilities of the parish. The clergy will then find a diminution of their labour, their responsibilities, and their anxieties, and will find also what we are glad to hear has been the result in Mr. Moorhouse's parish—an increase of the spiritual activities and susceptibilities of those who have at length been called upon to co-operate in Church work. Is it not an overwhelming argument for getting laymen into the service of the Church, that in increasing the benevolent and philanthropic activity of the lay members of the Church, you actually increase their spiritual susceptibilities and earnestness, and bring about, to a degree that no man could have anticipated, that mutual sympathy and communion of saints which we so much lack? Isolation has been the great difficulty of our clergy. The Church of England is the most isolated Church in the world. She is not only isolated from the Eastern and Western Churches by reason of their corruptions —as I hope she ever will be until those Churches reform themselves—but she is also isolated from every Protestant community in Europe. There is a painful isolation in the position of the Church of England; and so in the same way her clergymen are isolated from her people, and in many instances are the objects of much and deserved compassion. Take a clergyman, for instance, in a country village, where there is no resident squire, with two agricultural churchwardens, of the earth, earthy, as his only companions, who take no interest whatever in his work and give him no help. The clergyman in such a case has not a friend in his parish; and surely it is a great blessing to one so situated if he can find a single layman to whom he can state the difficulties of his position, ask for sympathy under his ministerial trials, and obtain his help. We are doing this in Marylebone; Mr. Moorhouse has done it well in St. James's, Paddington; and we hope also to do it in St. Mary's, Bryanston Square. Let these examples be multiplied, and the Church of England will then indeed become a living Church. I entirely and heartily concur in the proposed extension of lay agency. It is the greatest question that has yet been started at this Congress, and it is moreover the great question of the day—how to get the members of the Church of England to be willing, active, sympathizing, co-operating workers. And when this result is attained, the work which the nation is waiting for the Church to do will be done, because it will be attempted, not by ministers alone, but by ministers and people together; in other words, not by the clergy (which it never can be) acting as a separate and isolated class, but by the Church as a body enlisting the active services of all her faithful members.

The Rev. ROBERT GODOLPHIN PETER, M.A., Rector of Cavendish.

THE subject before this Conference is—Shall the laity be represented in the Synods and Conferences of the Church of England? I hope you will bear with me, for I shall speak honestly and plainly. I take my stand upon the words of the great authority—the great Head of the Church, who has all jurisdiction in heaven and in earth. When He rose from the dead, and appeared to His people, we are told that He came to the eleven, and not only to the eleven, but to those also who were with them. It seems to me, therefore, that from the very beginning our Lord has given authority in His Church that the laity should have full power to speak and to act in it with the Clergy. History informs us how His words were carried into effect in the workings of the Church; and history, alas! informs us how they were deviated from. Hence I believe the correct way is always to go back to principles—to take hold of some single principle, and to cling to it. I need not say more: for both by Archdeacon Utterton and Archdeacon Churton we have had it shown from history that the Laity have had their true place in Church Synods and Assemblies from the very beginning. Now I am going to speak in regard to a matter which has not hitherto been touched upon, and I hope you will bear with me in doing so. My words will be in respect to the house of the Convocation of the Clergy. I wish myself—though I may be mistaken—that the Convocation of the Clergy should be changed into the Convocation of the Church of England. I cannot see why it should be otherwise. Look, I beg you, to the constitution of the Houses of Convocation. I will take the Lower House, because I think that there the defect of principle shows itself in its completeness. How is that House made up? Does it even fairly represent the Clergy? It does not. Of what members is that House composed? Principally of nominees, directly or indirectly, of Government. And does that House command greatly the respect or excite the interest of the country, or does it command the confidence of the Church of England? I think not. With regard to the individual members of that House of Convocation I have not a word to say. They are faithful and intelligent men; and you cannot get better. But still they do not fairly represent the Church of England; and that is my great objection to the House as it is now constituted. Unless it is changed from the Convocation of the Clergy, into the Convocation of the Church of England, we cannot have very great confidence, or feel very great interest, in the debates of that assembly. Now, what would I have? I would have the Lower House of Convocation entirely elected. I would have half Clergy and half Laity. That is one of the great things to be done. It might be a danger—let us not be afraid of dangers. It might be a difficulty—perseverance will overcome it. Further—and here I tread upon delicate ground—out of that assembly, now made, by election, the assembly of the Church of England, I would elect an equal number of Laity and Clergy to enter the Upper House—the House of Bishops. I yield to no man in my respect for our Bishops. They are apostles, and hold their commission directly from our Lord. Our Bishops are equal in authority to the first apostles. But I do not read that our Lord conferred authority upon the apostles alone. It was to the eleven and those with them. I would pay great deference to my Bishop; but there must at the same time be perfect freedom for the Laity and inferior Clergy to express their opinions. The evil to which I have referred, it strikes me, extends from the House of Convocation of Clergy downwards into our Diocesan Conferences.

Now, I have said that in the House of Convocation something like three-fourths of its members are nominees, directly or indirectly, of the State. That is so very paternal, and I confess I do not like paternal Government—I am averse to it. I think if the Government is too paternal you do not foster the mental strength and intelligence of manhood; and it is of the utmost importance, in these days of controversy and contention, that you should make a strong-minded man as well as a man who will concede somewhat to others. In our Diocesan Conferences we have State Nominees in an undue number. Why should not the members of Conference be elected also, and represent the Laity and Clergy in equal numbers? Of course it might be permitted that the Bishop should have any whom he specially desires to be with him in order to assist him; and it would be well if our Bishops had each a standing Council. Lastly, go down to our Archidiaconal meetings; there we get a charge and no conference—a charge repeated till we know it by heart—but little opportunity of speech for Laity or Clergy. I have read that the Archbishop of York proposes to deliver his charge in one place only, and to hold conferences in different parts of his Diocese. I think that Archdeacons would greatly improve their visitations if they did the same. Now, if we, by God's blessing, can get this great change in the House of Convocation, it would, I believe, be of inestimable value; and why should we not get it through Parliament under such a Premier as we now have, who seems willing to do justice to our Church as Catholic,—and I hold that our Church is Catholic and Apostolic? Why should not this change come to pass? And if it did, then I venture to predict that the House of Convocation—then the Assembly of the Church of England—would excite the interest and would command the confidence of our whole Church. I believe that the more we strive to realize the word of our Divine Founder, so He will bless our consultations; and in that case we shall collectively, as well as individually, manifest ourselves with increased power to the world as members of the true vine, and bear much fruit, as He Himself has said, to the honour of our one Father above.

J. Carpenter Garnier, Esq., Rookesbury Park.

My Lord,—It is not my intention to occupy very long the attention of this Congress. I merely wish to offer a few remarks of a practical character. The question as to the constitution of the Councils has been well and ably gone into by former speakers; and I think it may be said that at any rate it has not been proved that the Laity were not represented in the Councils alluded to. It seems to me that it would be to the advantage of the Church of England, that in her Synods the whole Church should be represented. That is not the case now; for as long as the Laity are not represented, the whole Church is not represented. It has so happened that in the course of a visit to the United States of America, I had the opportunity, to a certain extent, of looking into the working of the Episcopal Church there; and from what I saw, I came to the conclusion that the Episcopal Church in the United States is most satisfactorily organized, and that it is doing a great work. There, as you are doubtless well aware, the Laity are represented in their Synods. They have one house consisting of the Bishops. In the other house the Clergy are represented, and the Laity also, and they vote by orders. Before this Synod was established, all the same objections were raised which are made now with regard to the representation of the Laity in our own Church; and I think you will see, if you look into the matter, that these objections have proved for the most part to be fallacious, and that in fact the Laity and Clergy have worked together in a most satisfactory manner. There is no doubt, that, as the representative body of the Laity, the House of Commons is not now a satisfactory representation of it; and if we had a real representation of the whole Church—if we had the Laity and the Clergy acting together in both Provinces combined into one Convocation, and the Laity properly represented, I believe the deliberations of such an assembly would have very great weight with the Parliament of this country; and therefore, I think, that such an arrangement would be of the greatest advantage to the Church of England. It is not my intention or wish to say anything but what is most respectful. I wish in all ways to show my esteem for the Clergy; but still I think a certain admixture of the Laity with them would be of advantage to the Clergy, and that the Clergy themselves, would, as a body, welcome their assistance. I must say, that I think, upon reviewing all the speeches that have been made, that the majority of the evidence is in favour of the representation of the Laity in Synods. Therefore I hope that something will be done in this respect; and I am sure that if the Laity are properly represented, they will in time be, so to speak, educated to take a proper part in the proceedings of the Synod, and the representation of the Laity will add to the strength, the efficiency, and the usefulness of the Church of England.

The Rev. JOHN HARRISON, D.D., Vicar of Askern.

THE few words I have to say, I wish specially to address to my brethren the Laity. The difficulty in regard to yourselves is your position in the Church of England. You are recognised as members of the Church of England, but what *status* do you occupy? Are you masters or are you servants? Now, it so happens that if the same question were applied to other Reformed Communions, we should find that in many cases the Laity are really the masters, and that those who officiate as ministers are ministers and servants. Our Church retains so much of what is ancient, that modern Churches are utterly dissimilar to it. It behoves us, therefore, to go back to early days; and we have been referred to those early periods, as for instance, to the time of St. Cyprian. Now, beyond all question, as a matter of simple certainty, the Laity who formed the Church, with her ministers after the Apostles, possessed supreme power; and hence, according to the strict argumentation of St. Augustine, in reply to the schismatical Donatists, who assumed more authority than they ought to have done, we find him declaring that the Donatist Bishops were but servants of the Church—that the Church preached—that the Church administered the Sacraments—and that the Church exercised discipline through the ministry, and that what was done on their part was done by the authority of the Church. Now, what might possibly come across this particular condition, is Priestly Power, which is supposed to have been derived from the Apostles; and we have already been referred to two texts (Matt. xxviii. 19, 20; John xx. 21-23) more especially, as the ground upon which a considerable power was presumably transmitted to those who were supposed to be the successors of the Apostles. To come to these two texts, "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." This, the first, was addressed, according to the intrepretation of the early fathers, not exclusively to one class of persons, but was interpreted and understood to apply to all Christians; and I believe, there is not a single instance on record in which this text is ever applied exclusively to the priestly office; and if we look carefully into antiquity, or study those who speak impartially as to it, we shall find that the authority was vested in the Church as a whole.

The learned Tostatus, Bishop of Avila, a Roman Catholic author, in his voluminous commentary, dwelling upon this point, states, "The Church, however, would not have had it (jurisdiction), unless it had been delivered to her from the beginning; for the jurisdiction of the keys is not such as are the jurisdictions which communities appoint for themselves by laws; for since this jurisdiction is in the remission of sins, and binding, men cannot frame it for themselves; but it is only from God, since He Himself remits sins. But, in the Church there is now this jurisdiction, and in this manner. When any one is elected for a prelate, jurisdiction is conferred upon him by election, for the Church had that jurisdiction, and could not exercise it, because she was not one person; therefore she conferred it on one man; and then, when the Chief Pontiff is elected by the Cardinals, he is elected by the whole Church, since they in the name of the whole Church elect" etc.—(*On Num.* xv. 33, 34; *Quæs.* 48, *tom.* iv., *pt.* i., *p.* 387.)

Then he goes on to show that the Cardinals represented the Lay element in the Church. I might refer you to extracts from St. Augustine and St. Cyprian; but as we have two different modern translations of St. Cyprian's Epistles, I would request my Lay friends and the Clergy especially, to read those epistles for themselves, bearing in mind that he was a Bishop of one Church out of 700 that existed in North Africa alone. He would not have ordained any one even as a Scripture Reader, nor as a Deacon, nor to

M

any other Office of the Church without the consent of the Laity; and he laid it down as a fundamental principle, that the consent of the Laity was absolutely essential to the election of a Bishop—a principle which we find running through all antiquity.

The Rev. J. B. Sweet, Vicar of Scalby.

My apology, as your lordship is well aware, for obtruding myself a second time to-day before this assembly is, that I am virtually charged with a message to it from the Convocation of this Province. For, having been called upon by that body to raise funds for a memorial to the greatest modern promoter of Synods and Lay co-operation, I feel that to allow the present opportunity and the present session of this Congress to pass by unoccupied, would be a censurable neglect of my trust. There are probably few persons interested in the present subject—*Lay Representation in Church Synods and Conferences*—whose hearts will not glow with a grateful recollection at the mention of the name, the self-devotion, the single-mindedness, the lengthened and successful labours of Henry Hoare. Allow me, therefore, to urge upon your sympathy and practical attention the fact that there is laid upon several tables, in rooms thrown open to this Congress, a large sheet of paper prepared for the reception of subscribers' names, headed, "The Henry Hoare Memorial at Keble College;" and to entreat you thereon to record your appreciation of the character and achievements of the most distinguished recent advocate of Synods and Lay co-operation. By the same act you will be strengthening and adorning the foundation of Keble College. Had Henry Hoare lived to be present at the meetings of this Congress, and especially at that of last evening, on Agencies for the kindling and revival of Spiritual Life, I may safely say that, by their tone and tenor, he would have been filled with joy and hope. But, my lord, I will venture to add, that at several of the statements here made he would have manifested displeasure and surprise. At the confusion of that Ordination which planted elders in every city with that anointing by the Holy Spirit which sanctifies and illumines all true believers—and at that similar confusion of ideas which identified the private priesthood and co-ordinate royalty of the members of Christ's body with the public office of ministering God's Word and Sacraments, committed to the ambassadors of Christ, he would have certainly shaken his head. At that strange assertion which we have just heard—that Parliament was made by Elizabeth a co-ordinate authority with Convocation for defining the Faith of the Church of England—he would assuredly have expressed a similar dissent; and would have suggested that the office of the Civil power was simply to give legal force and constitutional sanction to the definitions or determinations of the Spiritualty. And his line in this morning's debate (with all his jealousy for the Lay position, and for such rights as really pertain to it) would have been to deprecate the reduction of a Divine Kingdom to the condition of a Republic, and the delegation of the duties and responsibilities of the Officers of Christ's army to the army itself. And, my lord, I will take leave to add, that, in order to accelerate the convening of Diocesan Synods proper, side by side with Conferences of Clergy and Laity, he would have suggested to the Bishops a return to that plan which prevailed far more extensively amongst us of old than most men are aware the nomination of Rural Deans by the Clergy, for the Diocesan's approval; whereby those officers would become real representatives of the *totus Clerus*, and the difficulty, which now stops the way, of finding a satisfactory Clerical representation in an anomalous Diocese, would be happily removed.

The Rev. WILLIAM POUND, Appuldurcombe.

MY LORD,—I did not expect to have been called upon to add to the many remarks which have been made upon this subject; but I think there are one or two that still may be made, especially with reference to those Synods proper which belong to the constitution of the Church, as set forth by the Bishop of Salisbury; for the only constitution in which we can work with effect, is that which the Holy Spirit gave to the Church at the first; and if we depart from that Divine constitution, I do not conceive that we can with any reason expect to have the presence of the Holy Ghost with us. If we go merely upon the ground of human expediency, and if we form after our own notions representative assemblies—whether they be Conferences or Convocations—which seem to us to suit best the century in which we live, I think we must necessarily fall after a time into collision and disagreement amongst ourselves; because, wherever there is a representative assembly, there is necessarily a representation of something which exists. Now, in the Colonial Church, and in the American Church, there is a Lay representation in the Synod; but what does it represent? It represents the property possessed by the Church; and this Lay representation commences before there is a ministry of the Church at all. If you look into the laws of the American Church, you will find that if certain persons desire to have a church built in any particular district, the site being duly acquired or possessed, the Lay representatives may present themselves in Synod, and represent that property years before the church is built or the ministry is placed there; so that the example of Colonial or American Synods cannot be applied at all to the ancient catholic constitution of the English Church. The principle of representation, I say, involves something which should be represented. Now, what can now be represented in the English Church but differences of opinion? And therefore we should have the same collision in the election of the Laity to represent the Church in our Synods that we have in the House of Commons; and whenever the representation in the Church of the Laity takes place, there will be much commotion and a great deal of temporizing with the opinions of people throughout the country. Therefore, I warn the meeting against this evil day and its consequences.

There are the regularly constituted Synods of both Clergy and Laity combined, to which the Clergyman would necessarily take some Layman with him, to assist him in representing his Parochial Communion; and that is how the Church must do her Divine work. A particular man may be enlightened—perhaps inspired—upon a given subject and therefore fit to be sent to the Synod; but it is utter folly to elect any one man in a parish to represent it upon every question. He may be a good, a holy, and an influential man, but not necessarily competent to deal with all the matters which the Holy Spirit may from time to time moot in the household of the faithful. I would therefore press upon this assembly, and upon the Church, the urgent necessity there now is that her Synods be held; and, my lord, with permission, I would urge upon you and the Bishop, that you give countenance to none but "SYNODS PROPER."

The Rev. R. SEYMOUR, M.A., Rector of Kinwarton.

As an old member of our Church Synods I desire to say a few words upon what I believe to be the harmful defectiveness of our present system in regard to Lay co-operation. Convocation—of which I have long had the honour to be a member—is, I venture to say, the one Constitutional means by which the Church of England may express her mind in regard to matters of faith and discipline, and the worship of her members. In saying this, I do not forget that of which Sir John Awdry reminded us, that Convocation can make no change in these things without the sanction of Parliament and the authority of the Crown. Convocation is the guardian of the Church's faith, and the adviser of the Crown in this matter; and yet what is the position which Convocation has in the mind of the country, of the Church, and of Parliament? I believe it is strictly true to say that while Convocation is barely tolerated in the House of Lords, it can hardly be said to be recognised in the House of Commons. In illustration of this, let me remind you of what happened the other day. When the Bill for authorizing the new lectionary was before the House of Lords—that bill having a clause that the new lectionary had been approved by the Convocation of Canterbury and by the Committee of the Convocation of York—a noble earl moved that that clause should be struck out of the bill, and was followed in the division by twenty-four other peers—most of them members of the Church of England, and amongst them some of the leading Conservatives in that House. The clause was retained. Had, however, the Bill passed Parliament—thus making a most serious change in the reading of Scripture and in our public worship, without the concurrent action of Convocation, the Church would have had reason to complain of this as an unprecedented and unconstitutional act. For what happened at our last revision of the Book of Common Prayer? The Act of Uniformity of Charles II., which gives law to our present Prayer Book, carefully recites that the king first of all committed the matter to a body of divines and learned men; and secondly, that when he received their report, he remitted it to the two Presidents of the Convocations of Canterbury and York, and desired them to lay it before the Convocation; and having received it back, with their alterations, he submitted it to Parliament; and when Parliament approved it, it became law. Therefore, should Parliament now proceed to pass a Bill so seriously affecting our public worship without the joint action of Convocation, the act would, I repeat, be unprecedented and unconstitutional. The Bill, as you know, was withdrawn from the House of Commons without being discussed. Now, I come to the question—why is it that the action of Convocation commands so little respect in the Houses of Parliament?

[The Rev. Canon was proceeding to show, that if every Diocese had its Synod of Clergy and of Laity, members of both Houses of Parliament, who would have their place in such Synods, would get an acquaintance with Church questions, such as they have not at present, and might be expected to give to the work of Convocation a consideration and support such as they do not give to it now, when the tocsin of the debate was sounded, and the sitting of the Congress terminated.]

WEDNESDAY EVENING, 12th OCTOBER.

In the absence of the President, Earl Nelson took the Chair at Seven o'clock.

THE ORGANISATION OF CHARITABLE RELIEF IN ITS RELATION TO CHURCH WORK.

The Rev. James Amos, Vicar of St. Stephen's, Southwark, read the following paper:—

I. *There are various sources from which the poor are helped.*

They may obtain relief through the provisions of the law. There are charitable funds in connection with the religious bodies. In towns of any size where the poor get crowded up together into corners, societies have been formed with the view of bridging over the widening gap between the rich and the poor.

II. *Now the administration of these various funds is supposed to have introduced great evils.*

A destitute person can obtain help from the legal guardians of the poor; but we are told of the very same person getting more still from different associations, finishing or beginning the tour of the various relief stations round, by applying to the several local religious bodies—thus, one and the same person secretly becoming the recipient of a monstrous bounty, by the side of which, the fruits of ordinary industry looking very small, the very habits of industry are gradually relaxed, and in course of time are lost.

We are told how the example leads many more into the same fascinating whirlpool, of trying to get something of what is being given away all round;—and that thus, far and wide, the secret springs of self-help (not, indeed, to be made up by all the streams of outside aid) are running dry: so that from the well-to-do population, a whole army of thriftless destitute people is raised up, over and above the original objects of compassion—an army which, by vexatious appeals, takes a fearful vengeance upon the charitable who have called them forth: while unhappily, further and further off from the general crowding and clamour retire the deserving ones whom everybody wishes to help, but for whom there is little time to search out, still less aid to give, while there is a likelihood of there remaining no faith at all to believe in.

III. *Respecting these evils and their causes there is something to be said on the other side.*

There is a danger of drawing too sweeping conclusions about the poor, from a few isolated cases of successful imposture. It should take a large number of instances to prove a rule, where a great deal is being done for the poor—and at seasons when the givers of charity are liberal, and distributors careful not to miss any fair case, some clever bad people will have a chance, here and there, of being dishonest, from which no system would be free, and which, in ordinary times, might quite disappear.

It is also difficult to argue upon an increase of destitution. Appearances may deceive. There may be a number of destitute people in the background, only to seem new and large worlds, as it were, should people go to look after them—or they may come to the front, if a milder summer in men's feelings about the poor seems setting in.

It must also be remembered that there are, in most localities, sources of more or less reliable information. Take only the Church of England with her parochial system—and more with her spirit of working amongst the poor. Independent associations are found to work a very great deal through the information afforded by the Church, and in very close concert with her parochial machinery:—and, where there is less of this, the help which is given (as that given by legal guardians of the poor) is mostly given to a class of cases which might be very well taken as likely to receive it.

IV. *In view, however of the unquestionable evils of charity improperly administered, some plan more systematic may be advisable.*

It is proposed, for instance, that local committees should be formed, composed of all those who are interested in the administration of relief in each locality, and (in the case now before us, of various independent relief associations working over the same ground) that they should each contribute, for common use, information about the particular cases they are taking up. It is proposed that these committees should be so multiplied, as to form a network of agency throughout a town; the whole terminating or rather issuing from a general Council where information is gathered in from outlying posts; and from which may be diffused to them again such hints as general experience seems to sanction.

It is possible that this plan, if it were generally acted upon, would, at least in some quarters, throw such a light upon operations as would modify what would otherwise be given away. Independently, however, of their main object, the local committees might serve important purposes:—the wants of the poor would stand a better chance of coming to the surface: the exact proportion between what charitable relief provides, and what is required, would be determined: those idle vagrants, who almost compel an assistance which must draw upon the sources of help for the truly worthy, and who take away, at the same time, from inducements to labour, require, in the interests of all, the most summary justice; and these local committees might be useful in putting them in the way of it.

But, moreover, charitable resources must be put down, throughout, as a limited fund. As a fact, you cannot relieve every deserving person in a population of ten thousand, as things are at present: the right dealing in this state of things is one of the chief difficulties, and perhaps, the principal triumph of administration. Having help sufficient to aid ten out of a hundred distressed and deserving families, it may be spread over the hundred, so as to do none of them any good; it may be given to ten who do not so much require it as fifty others, who are therefore each more or less injured; or it may be given to parties for whom assistance might be as well or better got through other means; so that the help is very much, if not altogether, thrown away.

It so happens, that it may not be altogether consistent with the frugality required, to assist the most destitute cases: and for this reason—because to attend to these is the precise work which the unlimited resources, comparatively, of the legal guardians have in view. It is their duty to attend to these cases, up to the full measure of their necessity; a far more hopeful condition for the family, than mere driblets of aid begged out from other sources. Now these guardians will not always do this: if they would, charitable funds would be largely set free, to be employed in more productive fields; and the certainty of the destitute being kept from intolerable misery, would enable kind-hearted people to consider more leisurely and more wisely the different cases of distress which come before them. We hear how that kind-hearted people will keep invading the territory of the legal guardians; that they will tamper with the relief of the destitute; and thus, taking the law into their own hands, have left the guardians nothing to do, or less than they would otherwise have to do. The truth really is, that the astounding insolence, the reckless cruelty, and the illegal parsimony, which have marked, in some instances, the action of the poor law,—and just where, through its lower officials, it comes into contact with the poor,—have almost everywhere startled people into the field assigned to it; and it will be impossible now to draw them off, without some material guarantees being given, that unpardonable neglect, and unwarrantable insult can be no more. In making it *plain* that the poor-law officers, throughout their whole staff, mean to do their duty; or that the very slightest, but just sufficient, pressure shall be put upon them so as to leave their not doing it impossible (and the committees spoken of might help)—seems to lie a very important step in the organization, economy, and benefit of charitable relief.

V. *In some places, with the same principle of there being local committees, the field of distribution itself is being entered upon.*

In these places an army of visitors is raised, which is poured upon the poorer quarters of the town, each visitor taking the oversight of a very small manageable group of families: general rules to be strictly attended to are laid down, all pointing in the direction of not so much giving aid to the poor as teaching them how to do without it. The cities of New York and Edinburgh are most distinguished instances. That things have taken this different shape is, probably, from the question of wise relief having been started, when the problem had fewer terms. It would be premature to arrange for harmonizing the work of various associations, before any of them existed. In a more primitive state of things, there is the greater play for blind benevolence,—that disturbing element in the social atmosphere. This must be at once drawn off: there must be—as a first step—some channel for relieving the distressed, and so soothing the feelings of the kind and tender-hearted.

It will be known how that the same principle of providing visitors for the poor is very familiar to the Church of England. But in those places where charitable relief is in its infancy; where much is really required to be done; and where probably there will be many who cannot agree as to the best channels for help to pass through; some systematic, united, discreet effort like this, on the outside, must be welcomed as a distinct advantage to the community, carrying with it much of the power noticed as attending local committees of influence, and leaving the managers of Church Institutions—as they can scarcely fail to find—an ample field, which they can cultivate the more comfortably, knowing what is being otherwise done.

VI. *But the position which Church Relief Institutions should take up must be further examined.*

In the case we have considered, where there are many relief associations, the question has been occasionally proposed, whether the merely bringing all into harmonious working is the point to rest at. Would it not be better to reduce them all into one, and then pursue that one more simple scheme of visitation which we have last noticed; with however, this further element—that the Church relief associations should cease to prolong a separate existence, as much as any other? The Clergy, who have mostly to superintend the work of these associations, are said to be over-burdened with an additional labour, that is alien to their spiritual duties, destructive to the true progress of their people, and likely to subject their motives to injurious comment.

Now the distresses of the poor, often inducing incapacity to receive and temptations to neglect religious instruction, make their relief tread very hard upon spiritual duty; and, with the whole history of Christianity before us, it seems very like spiritual duty itself, to be taking a leading part in seeing to the feeding of the hungry, the clothing of the naked, the warming of the cold. There seems, from experience, no just ground to think that the Clergy, in giving up this department of work, would be generally likely, after all, to be more successful in the supreme objects of their mission: by withdrawing themselves from these exercises of kindness towards the poor, in the lower sphere of their daily life, I hold that to most there would be an absolute loss in the developing of those emotions of sympathy which go to form the very highest character, and to promote the very greatest usefulness.

The Clergy, as a fact, have extraordinary advantages for suitably carrying out the relief of the poor; they have supreme necessities for getting to know the people; they should not be without judgment as to character; they will not be inconsiderate to those in a low condition.

In the union of all relief associations, religious conversation and advice, which might possibly offend the prejudices of any one religious body, cannot and must not be freely indulged. Religious conversation is that which the poor most understand, and like best, as a rule: it is that conversation which sinks down into their hearts, and carries with it those who earnestly hold it. It is that conversation which is calculated to bring them the greatest relief; for the true mischief, at the root of the miseries of most poor men, is their ignorance and low moral condition. This is generally allowed; it will be considered that there is only one real remedy—the religion of Jesus Christ—which, when the heart is warmed at kindness received, there is a special opportunity of presenting.

And, further, charitable relief is but a little part in those machineries of mercy which are so multiplied in the Church of England. With the relief of the poor, the Church might resign these concurrent works. Will there be found those to take them up? or, if there should be, will there be found, under a different administration, the same supporting funds (drawn, as a fact, from the deeper religious feeling of the country) all flowing in as before?

VII. *But charitable relief may be organized on the principle of each—of several Relief Associations—choosing some particular part of the work, and being left in exclusive possession.* Now, as regards the Church of England, she must be regarded as much more than a mere relief association. She has spiritual duties to discharge to the entire population, and in these she could not consent to tie her hands from doing any good to any, if circumstances seemed to call upon her; but, while claiming this, there does not seem any reason for her, without real occasion, to go out of her way to intermeddle with all kinds of relief. There seems to be more or less mischief in helping all round, regularly and systematically, large numbers of the poor,—out of pure kindness, or merely because they are rather badly off, but have no good reason to show for it,—many of whom require some pressure to set them and to keep them at work; and who are thus encouraged, to their increasing injury, to rely upon periodical assistance, which, as time goes on, and more is required, must perplex everybody as to where it is to come from. It might perhaps be advisable, for the Church at least, openly to decline, as much as possible, lingering upon this enlarging part of the field—the tendency to make the poor more or less all pensioners, and the rather to withdraw to that generally safer portion of labour; and strongly to entrench ourselves within the limits which seem particularly pointed out to us, and which, for objects more fresh, more numerous, more curious, more extensive, but perhaps more questionable, have been strangely neglected—I mean the really effective care of the sick, of the aged, of the widow and the fatherless.

VIII. *Lastly. It must be remembered, that the foundation of all satisfactory relief to the poor is an intimate knowledge of the people.*

It may be asked whether the precise form of the instrumentality which is supposed to bear so much upon this, is really the best; *viz.*, the services of a good number of visitors, each to superintend a very few families. . . . I think more might be said for reversing this, and getting a few, who are thoroughly up to the work, each to take the charge of a comparatively good number of families.

There are persons of education, of experience, good business habits, and piety, who, for the smallest pittance to live on, would be thankful, in default of others, to give the necessary time for this real work; and as friendly hints are what the poor want, as much as anything else, might not a good deal of what is being given away be more profitably kept before the people, in this enduring and safer form of living men, and particularly living women?

In the way proposed, unhampered by a multitude of visitors loosely and lightly held together, the ground has been found more earnestly, regularly, and completely occupied; and if this idea were the one to be more generally worked up to—a good many families in the tight embrace of a few able hands—there might perhaps seem an additional security for maturing and rendering available that knowledge of individual character amongst many poor, which, with large masses of people, to those who have it, and at their fingers' end, must always render them least liable *themselves* to serious blunders in giving relief; and at the same time make them most capable of affording the very best assistance to those *others*, who, in the same way, are earnestly endeavouring to do good.

ALSAGER HAY HILL, Esq., read the following paper:—

The connection of the organization of Charitable Relief with the Work of the Church is, I believe, neither an artificial nor an arbitrary one. Being somewhat closely connected myself with a movement for the organization of Charitable Relief in the metropolis, I am fully conscious of my liability on the present occasion to incur the imputation of riding a hobby in the introduction of the subject at a Church Congress. I am, however, very anxious to speak here in my individual capacity, and not as agent of any organization. As, however, I hold this Congress, if worth anything at all, to be nothing if not practical, I shall not waste many words in a justification of my contributing a few thoughts on a subject which I am happy to see has two names, more directly representative of the Church, associated with it in your Programme.

By way of introduction, a few remarks will be sufficient to bring up the historical position of this connection of Charitable Relief and Church Work to the present date. In early times the connection of Church and Charity,—by which latter word I mean that vulgarly so-called, the distribution of alms,—was inseparable; and I may fairly assume that to the date of the Dissolution of the Monasteries, Charitable Relief was almost entirely in the hands of the Church and its ministers. With the dissolution of the monasteries very great alterations in practice were effected. Not the least of these alterations was the growth,—indeed one may almost say the institution,—of the Poor Law System, which has since been fraught with such wide and sometimes disastrous consequences to the English poor. With the extension of the Poor Laws the more immediate connection of Church and Charity seems to have fallen off; but as far back as the 5 & 6 Edw. VI., cap. 2, directions are given "That in every city, town, and parish a book shall be kept by the *Parson*, *Vicar*, or *Curate*, and the Churchwardens, containing the names of the householders and of the impotent poor; and that the Mayor and head officers in towns, and the Parson and Churchwardens in every parish, shall yearly in Whitsun-week" openly in the Church and quietly after Divine service, call the householders and inhabitants together, and shall elect and appoint two able persons or more to be collectors of the Charitable Alms of the residue of the people for the relief of the poor. And the Sunday next or Sunday following, when the people are at Church, "the said Collectors shall gently ask and demand of every man and woman what they of their charity will give weekly towards the relief of the poor; and the same is to be written in the same book. And the collectors shall justly gather and truly distribute the same charitable alms weekly to the said poor and impotent persons, without fraud or covin, favour or affection; and after such sort that the more impotent may have the more help, and such as get part of their living have the less; and by the discretion of the collector to be put in such labour as they be able to do; but none are to go or sit openly begging upon pain limited in the aforesaid statute."

With the 43 Eliz., cap. 2, says Nicholls, "The principle of a compulsory assessment for relief of the poor was fully and finally established as a part of our domestic policy." With that establishment, of course, the more direct agency of the Church as a channel of relief ceases; and since that time the assistance of the Church, apart from the special endowments attached to particular places of worship, has been of a purely voluntary and self-imposed kind. Passing over the intermediate period between the reign of Henry VIII. and the present time, there is little to comment on in this connection till we arrive at the new Poor Law Act in 1834, which placed English Poor Law Relief on its present footing. Its general influence, I need hardly point out, has been in a great measure to break up the centres of personal activity and substitute official, and too often narrow-minded, agencies in their place. During the whole of the period since the passing of the New Poor Law, the organisation of Charitable Relief on a large scale seems to have been but slightly attended to—the splendid experiment of Dr. Chalmers in St. John's, Glasgow, being the most conspicuous phenomenon in this relation to which it is now worth our while to recur. The general features of this experiment it is unnecessary for me to recall in this place with any detail—suffice it now to say that it was in *great measure* a Parochial and Congregational effort, and doubtless, though continued for some years after Dr. Chalmers's death, owed much of its success to the personal enthusiasm and organizing genius of its distinguished originator. The one point that most concerns me now, is the fact that it was an attempt of the Church from within to organize Voluntary Charity mainly through congregational agents, in the shape of its Deacons and other officers, as a counteractive and substitute for what Dr. Chalmers considered the evil effects of a legal provision for the poor. How far the partial success of Dr. Chalmers's plan,—for it can only be considered as a partial one,—is to be attributed to the strictly Parochial and mainly, as I repeat, Congregational conditions under which it was worked, I will not now pause to examine. He had "no doubt that under a kind, moral, and withal an uncontrolled administration of the Vestry, there would, from the free-will offerings of the Parish alone, be found a landing-place quite broad enough for the accommodation of the new pauperism, after that the old pauperism and its corresponding poor-rate should have wholly disappeared."

Since the time of Dr. Chalmers I am not aware of any experiment on a large scale having been made from within the Church to organize Charitable Relief. I am now speaking of England, being well aware of the interesting attempts made in Germany and America, and more recently in Edinburgh, with considerable success, though not *directly* through Church agencies. It may therefore, perhaps, be as well to consider my historical retrospect to close with Dr. Chalmers, and to pass at once to as careful a diagnosis as I can lay before you of the conditions of the problem at the present date.

In London then, at the present time (and I shall, from my fuller experience of the metropolis, direct my remarks chiefly to town organizations for relief), it may be said without fear of contradiction, that with the exception of the enormous sums expended from the Poor-rates, the major part of the community's alms is distributed directly or indirectly through the various Church and Chapel agencies.

One fact is, I think, sufficiently plain at once, viz. that with all the agencies now at work, both legal and voluntary, pauperism has increased rather than diminished. I do not desire immediately to connect the increase of pauperism with the imperfections of the existing arrangements as they concern the Church, but content myself with stating an undoubted fact. The conclusions from such facts will best be drawn later on in this paper. I now desire, apart from general results, to society involved in existing conditions, to call attention to the injustice too frequently occasioned, particularly to individual clergymen and individual districts, by the personal, or, as I may venture to call it, the clerical administration of relief. Speaking for myself, and with some considerable experience to support me, I may say, that in nine cases out of ten in which application for temporal assistance may be made to me, and without any knowledge whatever of the Congregational adhesion, if any, of the applicants who address me, after ascertaining the geographical district of such applicants, and satisfying myself that an appeal to the relieving officer would be of no avail, I have usually no alternative left me but to ask who the Clergyman of the District is, and whether he has been applied to by the person seeking relief. How far my experience may be exceptional in this matter, you are best able to judge; and how far also such a condition of things is desirable or natural, it is for you to consider.

In such a case as I assume above, it may be that, to take an extreme view, the applicant is a freethinker of the boldest order; that, far from having any congregational claim on a Minister of the District, he may be the bitterest and most persistent platform opponent. It may also be, that the District in which he lives is crowded with poor folks trembling on the verge of legal pauperism; and it may also be, that the united contributions from the Metropolitan Visiting and Relief Society, the Society for Relief of Distress, and all other sources of aid may be of the slenderest kind. Added to this (and I put this condition last as I cannot think a Clergyman is individually called on to fulfil the duty of his neighbour out of his own pocket) the Clergyman himself may be poor and embarrassed. On what ground, other than those of a supposed conventional necessity, am I justified in sending such an imaginary case to the nearest Clergyman of the Established Church? Why not to the leading Secularist lecturer of the district? why not to the secretary of some local philanthropic society that may undertake to aid persons in distress? In the nature of things, I am disposed to think a reference to the latter would be far more justifiable than the reference to the Clergyman of the Established Church. The *delegation* of all relief functions to the Clergy is, I believe, at the root of this most unsatisfactory, and yet undeniable, position. How far the delegation of duties, common to society at large, to particular Corporations or individuals, may end in the development of disease rather than the application of the remedies required, it is not necessary for me to enter upon here. The tendency has been recognised by the ablest students of Social Science as an axiom from the first; and it is not to be supposed that the general principle, when tested in the administration of alms, will be found more at fault than in any other department of duty. I am assuming, therefore, that the position of the Clergy at the present time is a delegated rather than an assumed one. But delegacy having, in most cases, declined into independence, the consequences are, I fear, little less disastrous than if an acknowledged independence had existed from the first. Now, apart from the injustice to the individual Clergyman upon whom the delegated burdens of his neighbours are cast, it is well for us to consider the natural effect upon those neighbours themselves. Not the least of these effects is the obvious loss of healthy individualism and personal charity, which should properly attach to every human agent in the best organized society. Not, be it understood, that I am here contending for the independent action of the individual in the casual administration of alms; far from it. Such exaggerated individualism is often the lowest form of active ignorance. But the recognition of intelligent interest in the principles of action if not in the persons to whom assistance is rendered, is, I hold, an essential element of the healthiest philanthropy. This recognition of principles, particularly of a politico-economical character, is under existing circumstances almost entirely lost sight of; and in many cases I have good reason to fear, that even the relations of masters and servants, employers and employed, and the mutual responsibilities which they involve, have been too often lost sight of in the delegated "charity" of the Clergyman, in whose hands all the beneficence of the District is supposed to reside. In the present crush of commercial life, and with the multiform distractions that beset every class of men and minds, nothing short of the most accurate though associated subdivision of labour in the administration of Charitable Relief, as in other departments of work, can possibly be effectual for thorough and permanent good. And yet it will, I think, be found that the present tendency to centralize all philanthropic influence and agencies in the Church or Chapel representative has had, and still has, a direct influence in opposite directions. But, apart from the more direct and material disadvantages of the present system of delegated and yet irresponsible administration, there are results, more subtle but not less disastrous, of a moral character, which I cannot now glance at even in the most general terms. The present position of the Church in relation to Charitable Relief is on all sides acknowledged to be unnatural and pernicious. A system of co-operation, however, with all agencies now at work, could not be better primarily developed than by all the knowledge of the Church and its agents being thrown into the common cause. The creation of some centre of common action is the chief practical difficulty that confronts us.

I may add, however, in this place, that for some time past the Church itself has been keenly alive to the sense of its imperfection in these matters; and I could, if necessary, quote opinions from every section of its representatives in support of this view. I must however pass on now to some suggestions for the future; and as I feel that in Church as in all other reforms the strength of any great change must rather be in internal forces than external pressure, the proposals which I am now about to tender for your consideration are rather of a general and tentative description, than of the nature of any detailed machinery, which must, I am well aware, be modified in different Districts to meet the varying local conditions. I assume that no general Church organization for the temporal relief of the poor, such as existed in former times, even with the existing tendencies to revivals of all sorts of the present day, will be even suggested for revival now. We may therefore reasonably, I think, treat this question as more immediately affecting the individual ministers of the Church in their several Parishes, than as affecting Church Policy as represented by Convocation, Congresses, or any of the forms of aggregate representation. With this assumption, then, I pass to the proposals which I have now to offer to you.

In the first place, then, I would lay down the general proposition, that the Clergy should, as a *matter of principle*, have nothing whatever to do in the direction of charitable relief, *in distinctly Poor Law cases.* I say advisedly as a matter of principle or *rule*, being well aware that the niggardly ignorance of many local Boards of Guardians with respect to out-door relief, makes it in some cases impossible for the Clergy or other administrators of voluntary relief to immediately and absolutely refuse the occasional supplementation of Parish Relief. The practice is nevertheless, in my opinion, highly objectionable, and most disastrous in its consequences both to donor and recipient; and a little well-organized protestation against the present half-and-half methods of Poor Law relief, would in a short time lead to most important and permanent results in the way of reform. Removing, then, as a rule, all Poor Law cases from the operations of Congregational or other Church District relief, I would further suggest that the *very large* class of cases of persons distressed by reason of alleged want of employment, should also be referred to a better court of inquiry than can possibly be afforded by an individual Clergyman or his agents, however active such may prove themselves to be. The complex conditions and circumstances which may determine the merits of an application on the ground of compulsory idleness, are such as in my opinion cannot be ascertained and adjudicated on without the assistance of a more varied and representative body of referees than the Clergy are ordinarily able to supply. A knowledge of the local trades, and especially of the various societies attached to such trades, is essential in these cases to any thorough and exhaustive investigation; and this knowledge can hardly be gathered either in the vestry or monthly meeting of district visitors or other parochial agents under the immediate direction of the Clergy. I therefore submit that such cases should also at once be put out of the pale of mere ecclesiastical machinery for relief. The same may also be said of the not unfrequent cases of persons requiring some very substantial aid for purposes of emigration or other permanent assistance; These ought not to be thrown either on individual Clergymen or merely Congregational Committees. If they are to be thoroughly and equitably treated with due regard to their relative merits, apart from their distance from a liberal Church or a wealthy district, they should, I hold, be treated by some body of men having, if possible, a wide, if not a Metropolitan, survey of all the circumstances under which the application for assistance is made. In saying this, I have no desire, as may be supposed, to unduly centralize charitable efforts, knowing as I do that corporations for benevolent as for other purposes may be found in one sense to have little or no heart; but it is very essential that as far as possible the administration of relief, when it assumes large proportions, as it does in the cases I am now treating of, should be based on the fullest possible knowledge obtainable. Not, be it understood, that I would advocate the grant, even of the trifling but most destructive "dole," under any but the fullest knowledge that circumstances permit. But I am well aware there are occasions, particularly in the present unsatisfactory condition of Poor Law administration, in our large towns, to which I adverted before, in which immediate action, if any, must be taken to be of any avail at all. And therefore there are times, though much less frequent than some are disposed to believe, at which the best judgment of the moment must be substituted for the fuller observation which all might desire. Nevertheless I am, I think, not far wrong in asking you to hand over to others than the Clergy a vast multitude of cases which, even under pressing urgency, would be best entrusted to an experienced agent either of the Poor Law or Organized District Charity; for I assume throughout that there will be established some centre of charitable action in constant correspondence with the Church Ministers. I may now be asked what province of Charitable Relief may still be wisely and safely left in the hands of the Church. I would reply, that in the first place a large number of chronic and sick cases which may not from some circumstances (which should be clearly defined and understood between the representatives of the Poor Law, and the Charities) be properly the subject of the Poor Law, might reasonably remain in the hands of the Clergy. And to such cases as far as possible a well-devised system of small pensions, such as, I believe is now contemplated by the Rev. W. H. Fremantle, in the district of St Mary's, Marylebone, might advantageously be applied—such pensions, however, being granted on the most distinct understanding that they were really, and not nominally only, adequate for the support of old age, and that any attempt to obtain other assistance apart from the sources of the pension would be at once resented by the withdrawal of the pension. There are, moreover, other extreme sick cases, of a distinctly congregational, I may perhaps be allowed to say, even a Sacramental, character, which may naturally remain in the charge of the Church and her officers.

Again, in the delicate investigations which relate to *character* of individuals rather than the *fact* of destitution or misfortune, the Church may, through its agents, prove of the highest value; but such investigation should be detached as far as possible from all immediate or even indirect connection with either temporal relief or spiritual proselytism. Once introduce an association between the visit of a minister and the possibilities of grant or dole, and the highest functions of the Church are gone for ever.

There is one other department of charitable organization in which I think the Church might materially assist, and that is in the district development of elementary providence. The providence which looks to the future of old age, as much as that which relates to the future of the soul, is certainly within the range of every teacher desiring the best welfare of those whom he is commissioned to teach; and for the inculcation of this providence, especially amongst the unskilled and as yet imperfectly organized branches of labour, the closest personal intercommunication and advocacy are, as I know from experience, primarily essential. It is to such *personal* intercommunication—not always now of the healthiest kind—that the countless Friendly societies of the poor owe what strength they possess; and the kindly interposition of the Minister and his agents on a similar field, accompanied by the diffusion of sound and simple knowledge on the subject, would I am certain be both valuable and acceptable to those to whom it was offered.

These I know are but typical details; and all are offered with an assumed relation to some recognised centre in each Poor Law District.

The suggestions, however, that I have thrown out in this paper with respect to the organization of Charitable Relief in its relations to the Church, will I fear seem somewhat slender and insignificant, when compared with the vastness of the general subject involved; but inasmuch as I cannot disguise from myself, and have no desire to disguise from this Congress, that the only healthy basis of any extensive organization of temporal relief under the existing circumstances of society must be distinctly a secular one, the more immediate sphere of the Church must in the future necessarily be a special and somewhat contracted one. At the same time—as I stated in the commencement of this paper—the Church has so long been, both by tradition and custom, so intimately involved in the administration of voluntary relief, that it is difficult, if not impossible, to sever such a connection without constructing at least some transitional methods of meeting responsibilities in the future. Some such methods I have attempted to indicate in the paper I have now read. How imperfect and purely suggestive such recommendations are, no one can be more conscious of than myself. But it is not improbable that the suggestions which I have made may at least evoke from others, more experienced in Church policy than myself, some support or opposition which will contribute to the gradual solution of a most difficult problem. In that hope I now commit my own reflections to this Congress, convinced that in the harmonious adjustment of all classes and all creeds (which it is to be hoped such Congresses as the present may do much to hasten on) for the common good of a common humanity, will be found the true principle of charitable as of all other forms of administrative action.

The Rev. Anthony W. Thorold, M.A., Vicar of St. Pancras, read the following paper:—

At the present moment there is serious uneasiness about the growth of Pauperism. What does the phrase mean? If only the certain fact that in London alone during the ten years, from 1858 to 1868, the number of persons receiving Poor Law Relief has risen from 3 to 5 per cent. of the population, it is something to be regretted, but not necessarily to be alarmed at. Pauperism, however, as some of us understand the word, is not so much an outside circumstance, as a moral habit, rapid in its growth, contagious in its progress, and demoralizing in its results, which in its worst phase deliberately prefers mendicancy to industry; in its best, sees no discredit in clutching at its share of alms, whether it needs them or no. As to this kind of Pauperism being on the increase, let each of us speak for himself. My own conviction, out of which I shall be only too thankful to be reasoned, but which is somewhat solidly based on sixteen years of a London ministry, spent in various proportions, in the parishes of St. Marylebone, St. Giles-in-the-Fields, St. George, Hanover Square, and St. Pancras, is that a kind of moral dry-rot is rapidly sapping the self-respect and independence of the London poor, and that if we cannot check it, in a few years' time neither our workhouses, nor hospitals, nor prisons, nor reformatories, will be half big enough for their inmates. Now, to glance at the causes which have brought this about will indirectly tend to indicate the remedies for it, and so lead us by the straightest path to the heart of our subject. I believe them to be these five. First, there is the existing Poor Law, which, notwithstanding the advantage of it as a whole, is nevertheless so undetermined in its principles, so irregular in its operations, so unsettled in its administration, and confessedly so imperfect in its machinery, that its present effect is to complicate rather than simplify the problem before us: and it is hardly too much to say that, until a statesman is found capable of closely thinking it out in all its bearings on Society, and harmonizing all its least details into a definite and consistent plan, the economy of life among the English poor must be seriously embarrassed, and the functions of philanthropy checked, if not paralysed. Second among these causes is to be placed the large number of small charities and doles, bequeathed by good men in times when our social life was very different, and which, if re-arranged by authority, and distributed on wiser methods, and with stricter limitations, might still be productive of real benefit; which, as at present administered, are a stealthy but fatal enemy to those habits of providence which are the true secret of a nation's wealth. The third cause is, that in some of our parishes much more is given away than ought to be given; that in many of them, what is given might be given more wisely; the result of it being to make the poor greedy, and selfish, and envious, and ungrateful; while as for ourselves, so far from its winning us affection, it too often earns us contempt. A fourth cause is, that we, all of us, Clergy and Laity, need more exactly and conscientiously to work out for ourselves the right and wrong, the expedient and inexpedient of almsgiving; and that until we are clear of our principles, and act upon rules in accordance with them, our almsgiving must be desultory, and inconsistent, and capricious, and irrational, if not mischievous as well.

And there is one cause more,—that which we are to examine this evening,—I mean the entire want of anything like organized co-operation among the dispensers of Charitable Relief, whether individuals or public bodies. The end of it is, that we are working in the dark; that the same ground is often occupied by charities of a similar nature, unconscious of each other's existence; that there is enormous and systematic waste of time, and money, and labour, and sympathy; and that, while the poor complain that some are helped a dozen times over, and others not once, the rich, justly dissatisfied by such helpless and pernicious blundering, are too easily hardened against giving at all. There is, however, this comfort, that all these causes are remediable, though in some cases the remedy has yet to be discovered; and as to a better organization of our system of relief,—though, of course, it can be nothing more than the mechanical application of previously settled principles, —it has never had the attention paid to it that its importance deserves, and should be seen about at once.

By "organization," we must understand such a regular system of skilful method, personal supervision, and entire co-operation as shall best combine economy of material and efficiency of distribution. Economy, however, not only of money, but also of time, and work, and thought, and pity; efficiency, both in originally determining the machinery through which relief can be dispensed to the greatest possible advantage, as well as in regulating the several forces of such machinery, so as to ensure the greatest amount of help from each component part. This then is what we are to try to get at to-night, in its relation to Church work; in other words, how we can best discharge that blessed duty of almsgiving,—about which a quaint proverb has said, that he who understands it is greater than a king,—in true harmony with the parochial system of a Church which would cease to deserve to exist, if she forgot the poor.

Organisation is partly a question of method, partly of instrument. As to the methods, to speak generally, they must be simple, so as to be readily understood; easy, or no one will take the trouble of working them; few, to ensure being remembered; living, as Mr. Helps reminds us, so as to provide the necessary checks on their own action; closely attending to details without being slaves to them; defined by precise regulations; for if principles are for philosophers, the bulk of mankind need the support of rules; capable of expanding naturally, yet constitutionally, and with as much flexibleness as is consistent with a definite plan. The methods themselves are, I suppose, much the same everywhere; those of strict investigation, discriminating and just distribution, punctual registration, and habitual conference. Where, however, improvement is chiefly needed is in the supplementing of these methods (1) by a more careful training of the living instruments who apply them, and (2), as I have already hinted, by a more systematic co-operation and correspondence with other labourers in the same field. No one needs telling that those who are to go about doing good, and relieving the oppressed, should be large-minded and gentle-hearted, filled with a spirit of unostentatious kindness, and trying to help man for the love of God.

What perhaps we should lay more stress on is, that they should also be intelligent and judicious; and that it is the plain duty of us parish priests to try to make them so. To go into particulars,—how many of us at our periodical meetings with our district visitors are at the pains we might be, carefully to instruct them in the elements of their work, or explain to them the principles on which funds should be given? How far, *e. g.*, it is desirable to supplement Poor Law Relief out of private funds; to what extent, if any, we should assist the poor, merely for being out of work; if it is ever wise to help to pay rent; if aid should always be in money, as Mr. Ll. Davies would propose, or never in money but always in kind, as others would propose; if want, resulting from improvidence or misconduct, is to be relieved at all, or only when other cases have first been assisted; if offertory pensions are expedient; if Christmas gifts are expedient; if it can ever be right to give in the streets; all these are questions which, not to speak too bigly about Political Economy, touch the very essence of wise almsgiving, and which we ought to talk over with those who work with us, that they may know on what principles to act.

Nor is this all. For ought we not also to try and teach them the true meaning of brotherly love; that material gifts are not the only gifts worth having; that they visit the poor, not as a better sort of relieving officers, but as human links between separated classes, and as handmaidens of the Church, and as witnesses for the Son of man; that, so far from being unwilling to go, because they have nothing in their pocket, they should strive after the moral courage which can say, "Silver and gold have I none, but such as I have give I unto thee:" therein true followers of that kind but wise Saviour, who, though daily He healed the sick, only twice fed strangers with miraculous food; and who has taught us, not too grossly or literally to interpret His own command, "Give unto him that asketh of thee," when He Himself refused to repeat His bounty to the greedy multitudes, who followed Him across the sea? But secondly, we have to develop a far more complete system of communication with other charitable bodies outside our own sphere. Not only, as I venture to think, should individuals, asking for information from us, readily procure it; but the statistics of relief, which in large parishes some of us compile for our own use, should be regularly at the disposal of authorized public bodies, such as Poor Law Officers, or the Committees of Hospitals and Dispensaries, or that Organization Relief Society of which we have already heard this evening, and which I for one mean cordially to help to the utmost of my power. No doubt we must be careful not to wound the sensitiveness of the respectable poor; but in all populous places "secrecy is one of the greatest shields and assistants to the impostor" (*Bp. of London*); and we are but trustees for the public of the funds placed at our disposal.

And this brings me to the last, but infinitely the most important part of our subject; the living *channels* through which this organization is to be employed. The figure which best illustrates my meaning is that of a series of concentric circles: the outermost, the District Visitors already spoken of, then Lay Agents and Parochial Mission or Bible Women, then the Curates, and as the centre of the system, the Incumbent; as to which last idea, I trust no one will think me guilty of grievous assumption, in assigning to the ecclesiastical head of a parish a place which must be filled by some one, and which public opinion has not yet quite bidden him abdicate. No doubt it is a function of great responsibility; and it is a curious question which would surprise the public, if thoroughly worked out, how much charity money in the course of a single year is entrusted to the Parochial Clergy. Of course we make some mistakes: for my own part, I should be extremely sorry ever to become so terribly shrewd-hearted, as to purchase an absolute immunity from the possibility of being taken in, at the terrible price of sending unhelped away but one whom my Master would have had me succour. Still it is a fair question for discussion, how far it would be for the advantage of all concerned if we could be altogether relieved of these duties. I only hope our Lay Brethren will speak out their minds, now that they have the chance; and it is indeed a pity if we cannot listen to their advice once a year, when they have to listen to ours once a week. For this at any rate we may feel sure of: that you do not wish us to forget our ordination vows, nor to become mere men of the cloister and library—a kind of painted figure-head to ornament a vessel's bow, but not to steer her; that you like us the better when we are strong all round; and that, recognising our obligation to discharge all the duties involved in our office, whether we like them or not, you are not so unjust as to identify habits of business with a worldly or unspiritual mind. Yet may the day soon come when in every English parish, of a size to require it, there shall be a recognised Church Body, to be the Incumbent's Parliament, and the Poor Man's Brotherhood; when we can really begin to believe that private relief may be given without encouraging improvidence; and that the five millions now said to be bestowed among the English poor of London alone, shall not smother, but stimulate their life.

For here after all is the true secret of a task, which in some respects is so enormous that we shall never accomplish it,—never even grapple with it. The best methods of organization are but a means to an end; they simply touch the surface of things; and merely to satisfy hunger is the aid we can give a brute. But it is the personal human individual contact of man with man, mind with mind, heart with heart, whereby, as with the true leaven of sanctified humanity, the masses are to be purified and lifted up to God. Indeed, there is no other way, and no better; we may mock at it as sentimental, or reject it as tedious, but it is the folly of the Church, and the way of the Lord. With human beings, gifted with their precious but terrible free will, all reformation must be self-made, from the heart and mind within. We Churchmen, with our Visitors, and rules, and tickets, and good books in our hands, are but like those true Red Cross Knights now ministering to the wounded on the French battle-fields; powerless to hinder the strife, or to control passion, or stir the dead, or drive back the tumult of war; able only to make pain a little less painful, and death less terrible, to soothe the wounded with thoughts of the Divine Healer, and to resist the works of the devil with the love of God. For let us clearly see what we can do, and what we cannot do. If we start on our crusade of mercy, dreaming that any efforts of ours will ever drive poverty out of the land, or that misery can cease, while sinful man is his own enemy, we shall soon throw down our arms in a contemptible despair. But we have not so learned Christ, nor the meaning of His Cross. "He that believeth shall not make haste." God Himself is working among the poor, though we see Him not, and in a way that we understand not. For

He teaches men by the things which they suffer, as well as by the words that they hear. He can purify and elevate the poor, not only through personal and social contact with their more prospered fellow-creatures, but also through that deep fountain of human kindness in their hearts, whereby, to their own rich usury, they so marvellously and self-denyingly help each other in turn. In the thought of George Macdonald, the blessedness of life depends more on its interest than on its comfort; that which is a curse when it makes us look down, may be a blessing when it bids us look up.

So, while we need not wish altogether to take the poor out of their Lord's hands, nor think that the little we can do is the limit of His goodness to them, let us thank Him for being willing to try to help them; let the only failure we ought to fear, be the failure of our own love and courage.

If wisdom makes us good, goodness makes us wise. The more that the Church rises to a true sense of the Divine purpose for humanity, and of His method in accomplishing it, and of the share He offers us in it, the more will she discover that the one key to the problem of restoring a man is to love him. In loving him, we treat him as God treats him; and in every act of kindness, however trifling, we shall be a sort of revelation of Him, who, Himself being love, shines forth in those who are like Him.

To listen patiently, to weigh carefully, to refuse kindly, to bestow cheerfully; to be just, and not cold, firm but not harsh, strong and tender, wise and cordial; to see in each man and woman, however degraded, the unit of a great nation; to recognise in every human soul, however brutalized, an immortal being for whom God was made flesh —this it is, to fulfil both the old law and the new one; this also it is, to hasten the kingdom of Him, who "with righteousness shall judge the poor."

ADDRESS.

Wyndham S. Portal, Esq., Malshanger.

My Lord,—Last night at this hour we were engaged in discussing the Spiritual Destitution, and to-night we are asked to consider what can be done to meet the Temporal Destitution, of the great mass of the people of this country; and I rejoice that a subject which has lately been discussed by the British Association at its late Congress Meeting, and by the Social Science Congress also at its late meeting, is thought to be worthy the attention of this great Congress to-night; for, in truth, the more we study the subject, and the more we hear about it, the worse matters seem to be. Certain it is, that since the Congress last met at Liverpool things have assumed a worse aspect than at that time. I am not going to say a word upon Church Alms as contributed through Offertories, because that subject was discussed fully and well at the meeting at Liverpool last year; but the question before us is a still larger one. And it is no abstract one, but most thoroughly practical; viz., What is to be done with the thousands and tens of thousands of people who are living around us and about us in the most complete and utter state of destitution. It is a question which not only concerns them, but, by putting it upon the paper, we confess it is one that also concerns us,—it concerns, I verily believe, the welfare of our State as well, and the flourishing of true religion amongst us.

The question is, then—How can we as Churchmen, and not as Churchmen only but as Christians, assist and relieve our poor while we defend ourselves from giving to those who are unworthy,—"mendicant professional solicitors," as they have been called? Our President last night said that our subject is how to systematize our acts of charity, so as to improve the condition of our poor physically and morally. We, as Churchmen and as Christians, must give alms; but not only that,—we must do so carefully, we must do so with discretion. It is not with our money only, but it is with our time, our trouble, and our strict investigation into (as one speaker said) the right and the wrong of everything connected therewith. I do not grudge, my lord,—God forbid that I should grudge for one moment—the £250,000 which have gone to relieve the miseries of our poor neighbours abroad. Much good may it do them; and I am sure it is creditable to this country, and we all feel glad that we have contributed thus far to their relief; but I confess that, after all, the thought has struck me that "charity begins at home." And when I see ladies by the score, I may almost say by the hundred, picking charpie and making bandages, it has occurred to me whether they have ever thought that charpie and bandages are wanted for our own poor. I would ask those gentlemen who have just addressed this meeting—gentlemen who know much more than I do of the real distress and suffering in our huge Metropolis—whether the hospitals of St. Thomas, St. George, St. Bartholomew, and others, are amply supplied with all those articles which the ladies are working hard to send abroad. I say again, God forbid that any one here should grudge what is being done; and I hope and believe great good will come out of this very act of charity. It will, first of all, teach us that we need never be idle, but we can all do something for the poor; and I think it will also make the same thought occur to many that has occurred to me, viz.:—Is there no misery at home to alleviate when we have, as I hope may soon be the case, fully ministered to the sufferings of those abroad? Are we satisfied with the present condition of things? Is there need of organization, or are we all going away from here, each doing our little best, the State also doing likewise—and it is very little indeed that is done by the State through the Poor Law, while the Clergymen of our Parishes, for the most part, are doing a very great deal—the benevolent and the philanthropic doing that which appears, as far as they think, within their power. And yet see where we are. What is the condition of our poor? And the question again arises, What are we to do next? I do not want to ask the present company to read the Government Blue Books concerning the distress of the poor; but I say they may spend their time worse than in reading such reports of the Poor Law Board, and others, and seeing how year after year the poor under our very eyes are increasing in number as well as their poverty increasing in intensity. Well—not only that, but if some of us here think, after hearing those three gentlemen who have been kind enough to read papers referring mainly to the Metropolis, that in the country we manage things better, then let me ask those ladies and gentlemen to read the reports but lately issued by the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the employment of women and young people in agriculture. I will do no more than allude to that report, and say, if you have not read it, I will ask you to do so [for I know that horrible bell will soon be upon me!]; but nothing can be more dreadful and more scandalous to a Christian country than the accounts which those pages reveal to us. There is misery and distress under our very eyes—of those who have parks, under their very park walls—of those who have villas, close to their very premises—enough to make one's hair stand on end; or at least to make us ashamed of ourselves as a Christian nation.

I do not know whether Canon Gregory is here; but have you read the words he uttered while preaching lately to the University of Oxford, when he urged the young men of wealth and influence now growing up to years of discretion, to have pity upon the poor, and thus do good to their generation? I merely call your attention to these and other statements. But notwithstanding Canon Gregory's efforts in the West of London, Mr Lowder's in the East end, and those of Lord Shaftesbury everywhere, there are, according to a statement lately made by my friend Mr. Marx, more people so that I had the honour of being in a small minority. I have run off the reels rather, and I have put down a great many things here; and as I have been speaking so at random, you will allow me to allude to two or three things to which I want to refer before I sit down. I think that the Clergy may support hospitals and dispensaries; that we may encourage friendly societies; that we may *amalgamate* with the people; that we may, for instance, attend Foresters' and Oddfellows' meetings, and all those beneficial agencies which have this for their motto,—namely, "to help the poor to help themselves." I hold that a shilling spent in helping a poor man to help himself does far more good than a pound spent in giving him charity. And I do think this, my Christian friends,—that we ought, all of us, to try as much as possible to help the poor to help themselves. Let us have clothing societies, and let us give donations towards them; let us have blanket societies—let us have shoe clubs, and all those agencies with which we, as Clergymen, are familiar. I may also mention among them coal clubs and provident societies. We ought to encourage as much as possible saving habits among the poor, and not pauperize them; because I think the poor man has as much right to stand up and feel himself independent, provided he keeps off the rates, as the rich man. I honour the blacksmith in his vocation, who does his duty and strives to keep off the rates, as much as I do a barrister or a peer of the realm in his vocation. Now we should endeavour, of course; to bring all our Charities towards the Church. I come from a small parish in Dorsetshire, where there is no public-house, and where, I am happy to say, I have never been asked to give a fraction, and I should be very sorry to (a laugh)—to demoralize the people, because they don't want it in that way—I mean by *direct* help; but by a clothing society, a shoe club, and in a variety of other ways, we try to help the poor to help themselves. And now, before I sit down, I wish to allude to one subject very briefly. We should *economize.* We should remember that the Laity look to us in the matter of alms, and say we do so much and we don't do so much, etc., etc. Then there are those who look at the Clergyman's wife as she goes in dressed to Church on Sunday, and say, "Where does she get the fashions from?" Now that Paris is besieged, I wonder where the fashions do come from. I don't know whether they are caught up in a balloon or not. I know I am trespassing upon delicate ground. I say,—let the Clergymen's wives lessen their wants and save to give. We should all economize in every way we can in order to spend on the promotion of charitable works; and let me say also, our wives ought to co-operate with us. I do think it is a pity we see Clergymen's wives so dressed as I sometimes see them. We know that what they put on their heads is something like the Tower of Babel, and we know this must cost something, and that the dresses they wear must cost something; and the wonder is where the things come from. Let us look at these things. The Clergy wear a conventional costume which looks very becoming, and I don't see why we should not have a sober costume for the Clergymen's wives. Oliver Goldsmith said, "The nakedness of the poor might be clad from the trimmings of the vain."

E. W. Hollond, Esq., Benhall Park, Suffolk.

I agree with the major part of what has been said; but I cannot help remarking upon the tone with which my friend Mr. Hill's statement, that the work of Charitable Relief should be separated from Clerical work, was received. I should have thought here that the precedent of the ancient Church as well as the usage of the Church of England —whereby the distribution of alms was entirely committed to the Lay officers of the Church—would have had considerable weight in this assembly; but I will pass from this consideration to the more ordinary and the more utilitarian consideration which weighs heavily on my own mind, and that is this:—I have a large acquaintance with the Clergy of London—with the Clergy of the east and the densely populated parts of

London; and one good reason why they should not devote their attention to the distribution of Charitable Relief is simply this—that they have not got the time. They have their whole time occupied with spiritual duties, and nobly they work at them. But I here give my testimony, after an extensive acquaintance with the Clergy of London of all parties and descriptions, that I cannot recollect a single instance where any Clergyman of experience has not said that he could be well rid of this work of charitable relief. But those who imagine that charity or the work of charitable relief—that philanthropy in any of its branches—will ever be divorced from Church work, imagines something which will take the very heart out of religion. Philanthropy and religion will never be divorced; but philanthropy and the maintenance of special dogmatic tenets will be divorced; and therefore I maintain that we shall require an organization for philanthropy. Now with regard to the nature of charitable relief, it is only a very small branch—a minute part of this great question of charity—true charity, the ἀγάπη of the New Testament. With regard to this work of charitable relief, I wish any words of mine would impress upon this assembly the extreme danger and extreme difficulty of the matter. You are playing with edge tools, if you are playing with this question of charitable relief, which concerns the welfare of the whole community. It is not altogether a question of the material condition of the community; it is a question of their moral and spiritual condition; and if by any lax method of distributing charitable relief you degrade the community, you will be doing that which is contrary to the laws of God and man. This being the case, I will point out my own firm conviction that charitable relief in England is not distributed as it should be; it is not distributed with due wisdom and care. We have got this system of small doles,—these wretched eightpenny tickets, these wretched tickets for a half hundredweight of coals, or a loaf of bread—which do more to demoralize the poor than anything else. Let us sweep away these things. But acknowledging the difficulty of this position, I shall say that what is at the root of it is, that we have not got the men, nor gone on the right system, to carry out this work. As far as I know of the position of the Clergy in London, they have not time to attend to it. As a Layman, then, I would impress upon you two things: they who undertake the work of charitable relief must study the laws of political economy. The laws of economy are the laws of God, and the Church of God can no more afford to disregard them than she can any other laws. We want men of head and men of heart. We know, as Mr. Thorold has said, the Clergy are willing to give the best advice to the Laity; but bear with me for a moment when I say I wish you would tender us less advice about giving to this society or that—I wish you would make fewer collections at your Church doors for these purposes; but I wish you would give us more advice that we should raise ourselves up to the position of true Churchmen and Christians—that position of being priests unto God;—I wish you would collect at your Church doors, not merely silver and gold, but men and women to go about doing the Church's work that is to be done. During my life I have heard so many sermons with regard to charity, and so few going right to the heart of charity. At least, that is my opinion, whether it be true or false. The re-kindling of life in the Church, I think, bears upon this matter. A Church like the Church of England, which professes that faith without works is dead, must also profess to carry on her members to the performance of those good works which God has prepared for us all to walk in. It is not for a Layman to dictate in these matters to the Clergy; but I merely wish to throw this out as a suggestion. I know there are many Laymen, to my own certain knowledge, who would be ready to give themselves to this work were they called upon to do so in distinct terms by the Clergy. You, my brethren of the Clergy, have a power in the pulpit which you hardly dream you possess. We Laymen know—we, who criticize your sermons, and in criticizing seem to find fault sometimes—know well the power of the pulpit. We listen to what you say much more than you think we do; and if we ourselves were directed in this matter, I am sure you would raise up a number of living members who would take away from you this work which you acknowledge,—for I believe the Clergy as a body acknowledge it,—to be a work foreign to your own duties, and would leave you mor leisure for those spiritual works in which we, as the Laity, feel it most necessary you should shine ; for we cannot afford that you should give up spiritual duties for those of a temporal character. And let me add, my lord, there is another view of the question I should like to bring before you. The Church of England having, as it has, a legal status, has the power to call in men and women of various denominations outside that Church for work connected with charity, which I acknowledge to be a religious work, upon a broader basis than mere denominationalism—a broader basis even than the National Church of England. I believe you would, if you were to try, succeed in getting a large number of Nonconformists to join in this work ; I believe they would always give that place and preference to the Church of England—that they would always acknowledge the legal status of the Church—that they would always be ready to work with you in this matter—and that the very best results would arise from this concourse of the Laity of the Church and of the Nonconformists. You would find there was more charity between each than you ever dream of now ; you would find many bonds of union ; and if I might be allowed to look forward to the day when the national Church of England shall be more elastic in her system, and when the sects of England shall be less narrow in their sectarianism, I should also be looking forward to the day when the Church shall include a large number of these sects ; and these, which we have been considering, may be the bonds which shall draw them in,—the bonds which have always drawn a community together—those of love and of charity. And then before the world the Church of England will present a spectacle which will enable outsiders to say those words which had such great power in the spread of the Church's influence in olden time, —" See how these Christians love one another."

The Hon. and Rev. S. Best, Rector of Abbot's Anne.

My Lord, Ladies and Gentlemen,—I am desirous of not letting such an occasion as this pass over without offering some few remarks upon the subject before us. I think that I shall do well to devote the minutes allowed me by the rules of our Congress in endeavouring to clear away what I consider mists in the way of our understanding this great question. In the first place I must strongly object to the use of the word "charity" in the sense in which it has been applied here. I do not admit for a moment that any alms-giving, unless it be in the spirit which sanctifies it, is charity. And I believe that if we clear away difficulties on the subject of what charity really is, we shall save our resources—we shall save those five millions we have heard about—we shall save those eightpenny tickets talked of just now, which I cannot help considering,—though speaking only as a country clergyman, which I have been all my life,—must be powerful instruments for demoralizing the people, as leading them to come with tales full of deception and fraud. What I am anxious to see is, in each parish, whether it be in London or whether it be in the country, such a system as shall include all the humbler classes of the parishioners, men and women, old and young,—not to prop up the poor's-rate, not to modify the poor's-rate, but absolutely to do away with it. For of all the evils of the day—except only in the Union Houses for the reception, as a kind of hospital, for the old and sick,—for which they might be reserved—I know of none which have tended so effectually to demoralize and degrade the inhabitants of this country as the Poor Law. I have lived long enough as a minister in the Church to see the Poor Law under two phases, and there are few perhaps who have so fresh a recollection of it as I have. The first law proved so bad, and became so corrupt in regard to the manner in which it was carried out, that the State was obliged to pass what is now the Poor Law to endeavour to remedy the abuses which existed under the previous Law. I myself went into a parish of upwards of six hundred people, and could not find one of the labourers who had not received poor relief. In speaking to this meeting, I would express the belief that we are going back to the same state of things as fast as possible. We are gradually allowing one abuse after the other to creep in; and we shall entrammel the poor man and honest labourer of this country just as much as we did in the days of which I have spoken. We do not give him a fair chance; and the time will come when, as it was then, a portion of every man's wages, it will be ingeniously contrived, shall be paid out of the poor's-rates. These are points which I think we should look at seriously and as men of forethought. Don't let us give right and left indiscriminately and call it charity. I say it in the presence of many who must bear with me when I venture to say it, that the person of all others whom I should dread, and whom I should not wish to come into my parish, is the person passing under the name of Lady Bountiful. Of all the evils which can be done to a parish, none can compare with the mischief such a person inflicts in indiscriminate giving. I know, as I have already said, that I have no experience of what it is in London; I have no experience of what it is in large town parishes, and have no doubt that different systems must be adopted—different organizations must be employed—to carry out the plans which we wish to see brought into operation. But whatever that system or organization be, don't give,—or rather so give as to compel the person whom you assist or lead, as one of my predecessors said, to help himself. Teach him how to help himself, and from the very first moment you assist him, insist on his doing some part of the work for himself; or, except in extreme necessity which knows no law, don't assist him at all. I will not occupy the attention of the meeting further than to express the hope that we shall see such a good system established and worked out—not, as I have said, merely for the purpose of alms-giving, but for such purposes as shall teach the poor to help themselves, and shall diminish, if it may not altogether do away with, the demoralizing evils of the Poor Law.

The Rev. Thomas Richardson.

My Lord, Ladies and Gentlemen,—I had two years in Lambeth, two in the south of London, and I have had twelve in St. George's-in-the-East, and after those sixteen years I was not astonished to hear Mr. Goschen very recently state that it was his opinion, or rather he was growing into that opinion, that the increase of pauperism in London and elsewhere proceeded from the peculiar law of this land which gives the poor the right to demand help, which no other country in the world, as I understand, allows. That, I think, does away with the idea that the amount of voluntary relief supposed to be given to the poor of London is bringing them down more and more to pauperism. Now I feel, my lord, that this question is one of the deepest importance to Clergymen. I was not ordained to be a relieving officer, but I do find certain things forced upon me as a London Clergyman by the force of public opinion. And we cannot get out of the difficulty of doing something for our poor. There are certain organizations at work throughout London of the most important character; but for these sixteen years I have seen the importance and the wisdom of the remark of the Apostle, when he said, "Silver and gold have I none, but such as I have give I unto thee." Yes, and I beseech every Clergyman, and every Scripture Reader, and every City Missionary, and every spiritual agent, to have nothing to do in giving relief directly. As one having had a few thousand pounds through my hands for the benefit of the poor, I can say I have never given a shilling in the visitation of my people; but I have endeavoured as far as I could, with the funds placed at my private individual disposal, not to be known to anybody but myself and my God. I have tried to follow the example of my Master, "When thou doest thy alms let not thy right hand know what thy left hand doeth." I have many times conveyed practical help without the recipients knowing from whence it came, except they traced it to the fact of God watching over His people. I am astonished to find that certain workings of our great societies in London have been, in some senses, not fully brought out. There is the Metropolitan District Visiting Society, which has the confidence of the people of the land; for they do give a fair amount of money to that society every year. That society does not give through the Clergymen; and it is provided that we shall have a monthly meeting of district visitors, that those visitors shall not be paid for their work, that they shall go on certain defined districts, and that the money granted shall be in proportion to the number of visitors on the ground. Then the distributions are made in kind; but I may state that the difficulty of finding district visitors in London is so great that, out of a population of 50,000 in the parish of St. George-in-the-East, there is scarcely one individual who, having the ability, has the time to give to house-to-house work. But every step of my ground is visited every week by the district visitors for the purpose of exchanging tracts and recording the names of those who are sick. Those names are immediately handed to my parochial nurse, who distributes every farthing of relief in kind—sometimes in bread and grocery, which I believe is occasionally a very good way of giving relief. These people are supplied with beef-tea and other necessities, which perhaps the Poor Law does not furnish. And by the system of relief which the Metropolitan Visiting Society adopts, giving amounts to a certain number of visitors, I find that the wonderful amount said to come into our hands is absorbed —every farthing of it—by giving a small proportion to the relief of the sick, and the sick only, through the hands of a nurse who has nothing to do but attend to the sick. I feel that I can guarantee that there is not a single individual finds his or her way to my church for what they can get out of it; and I feel especially, having been always in mission districts of the greatest importance, that we shall not accomplish much real work with the money in our hand. I think nothing does greater injury. The Visiting Society grants what I have stated and no more. If our friends will organize some society to take the whole responsibility, well and good. But bring the people to carry it into effect. What is the good of mere talk, talk, talk? Bring the people; but in the meantime we are doing a work, and doing it, I believe, very admirably. So far, then, as to visits from house to house for the sick. There is another admirable society, the Relief of Distress Society, originated in that terrible winter of 1861, when down came some gentlemen from the West-end, and we were thankful to receive them. But they went to the bakers, butchers, and grocers, and asked who were the most deserving poor. They had not much faith in the parsons. But what did they find? The grocer and the baker each gave the names of persons who owed them money; and no sooner was the money paid than they went in for it, and the poor people consequently received no benefit. Then what do we find now? After six or seven years, that almoner who adopted the course I have referred to, came to me in St. George's-in-the-East and said, "I am prepared to acknowledge that the men who know most of the poor in the east of London are the Clergy;" and so it has fallen back to the Clergy. That society gives special help to special cases. There are those of the poor whom we should send to the Board of Guardians; and I have found Boards of Guardians ever ready to receive applications from the Clergy, and back it up by proper relief. Then there are peculiar difficulties which we must deal with under peculiar circumstances. We have had several difficulties to contend with in the East of London —such as a hard winter, the cholera, and then the crash in 1866, which we are only now just getting over. Strange to say, we are told to-night that thousands of pounds have found their way somewhere and done a deal of damage. I found a man in a street called Pennington Street, with his wife and three children, in a back-kitchen, all of them being obliged to sleep on the floor. What should I do with such a man? Give him a shilling and send him to the workhouse? No! send him over to Canada. And what did he write to me the other day? "We have plenty of work—living on the fat of the land, with meat three times a day, and the children all fat and well." I was asked in coming down to this meeting—and I never thought of speaking till the question was brought to my mind—how it is that in the East of London pauperism has so largely decreased while it has increased so largely in other quarters. Well, my friends, I answer the question by the word *emigration.* We sent away last year some thousands—and, all honour to ladies in the West-end who have found money and material, we are prepared any day at twelve hours' notice to send families off. I say this is helping the poor people to keep themselves, and on that point I agree with everything that has been said. May we, then, go forward, and may God give us his blessing!

J. Shaw Stewart, Esq.

My Lord Nelson,—The last subject we had before us was Emigration; but I think we must return to that immediately before us, namely, the organizations for the relief of the poor in this country. Many allusions have been made to-night to the work of the Poor Law Board. Mr. Alsager Hay Hill, in speaking on the subject, took us back to the pre-Reformation period, when the work of charitable relief was performed at the doors of the monasteries. We have heard it raised as one of the greatest charges against monasteries, that they fostered and encouraged pauperism by indiscriminate relief. Whether that be true or not, we have come back to a similar state of things in the nineteenth century; and after the quotation made by the last speaker from the statement made by the President of the Poor Law Board, I think I may fairly say that amongst the possible changes in this age of rapid and striking reforms, may be the disestablishment and the dissolution of the Poor Law Board. At any rate its present working is so chaotic, that I think the Church must not look too much to it in studying its rules with respect to charitable organizations. We have all felt the importance of this subject, and I am very glad that this Congress has taken it up. To-night we have been told that this is a time for Laymen to come forward; and I must say I consider it is pre-eminently—I speak of the material relief of the poor—a Layman's question. I cannot say, with the preceding speaker, that it is in any sense the fault of the Clergy that this question has remained so much in the province of that body. The Clergy must not be relieving officers; and too much of their time, at any rate in large towns, is taken up in relieving the material necessities of the poor. I think there is one way in which the Laity can remedy that. We cannot all give very much time to this subject. Many have professional claims which absorb the greater part of their time; but there are several—and, God be thanked, their number is daily increasing in the Church of England—who are daily prepared to lead a life of duty to God and to God's poor. But I believe the way of all others in which the organization of charitable relief is to be promoted by the Church, is in drawing devout and constant helpers, both men and women, around our Clergy. I will not touch upon any party question; I do not care whether the women are called sisters, deaconesses, or by any other name. The field is so large that we must all work together. We hear frequently that abroad—in France, for instance—there is a better system. I have had some experience in the organization of charitable relief in London; I know nothing of the organization of charitable relief on the Continent; but if these matters are better managed in Paris and elsewhere than in our own large towns, I believe it is owing to an organized system of relief, by which there are a number of men and women who devote themselves, not as philanthropists, but in the name of the Church, as simply doing their duty to God's poor. Political economy alone will not help us. Putting aside the sick and aged, and those who may be properly termed objects for relief, there are a number of people whose wage is so small that it is impossible for them to keep body and soul together. These are the objects with which the Church must deal. I will not detain you with instances, but merely mention one—an enormous class—those who live by their needle. The highest price paid for shirts—a large article of trade—coming from slop-shops, is but 3*d.* a day, that is, if the poor people are fortunate enough to get it direct from the shop; but these articles are often doled out from hand to hand at a second price of 2½*d.* The lowest price for which a man or woman can get a respectable night's lodging is 3*d*. I cannot enlarge upon a subject like this; but you can imagine how frequently these miserable wages are eked out by the wages of sin. There is only one way in which the Church can regain her due power and influence to save souls. It is only by constant, self-devoted work that this can be carried out. The half-hour here and half-hour there will not do for that work. But where the Church system is thoroughly carried out, and where the Clergy can have self-devoted helpers who not only have time at their disposal but are willing to give their whole time, I believe spiritual aid will be largely given, and where material aid is to be given, there, certainly, spiritual aid is most needed. We have bad times, I believe, before us. There is one subject which has not been touched upon to-night. All have spoken nore or less of the increase of pauperism, and various causes have been assigned for it. One cause, I believe, is owing mainly to the ill-guidance that the poor have received from many of their own class. The system of trade-unions and of fixed prices amongst trades has driven an immense amount of labour out of this country. When we hear that in St. Thomas's Hospital alone every window-sash and every door-frame came from Sweden, and when we know that throughout the building trade this is becoming quite a daily occurrence, we must feel that there is an immense amount of labour going out of the country; and year by year there will be more for the Church to do among the masses. I did not expect to-night that we should have heard that the narrowness of the Church of England her narrow system—in any way hampered the work of charitable organization. A great deal is done in many directions by the Dissenters, but in large towns it is comparatively little. I was quite surprised, when working on the Bishop of London's Fund some few years ago, to find how many dissenting chapels there were for sale; and we bought several of them. They had been once attended by members of the middle class; but the members and the chapels had both emigrated to the suburbs, and left the poor to shift for themselves. The Roman Catholics, as a body, I believe do as much as any community for their poor; but the mass of poverty they have to deal with is enormous. I do not think it an exaggeration to say that one-third of those receiving relief in London are Irish Roman Catholics. Let us work on, each in our several ways, and let us, the Laity, take this up as our question, and relieve the Clergy in rendering material help to the poor. Let that be our work; and let us rally round the Clergy in helping them in regard to the spiritual needs that also require to be met. I think we have heard to-night that improved organization is to take the work altogether out of the hands of the Clergy; but one of the papers read—that of the Rev. Prebendary Thorold—I believe, gave a complete answer to that idea. As long as we have the Clergy zealously working among the poor, let us as Laymen go forward, and give up our time and our best efforts in order to do our part in the good work, and render that assistance and co-operation to the Clergy which shall be practically useful in dealing with this all-important subject.

Mr. ALSAGER HAY HILL remarked that Mr. Shaw Stewart was in error in supposing him to have said that, in the organization of Charitable Relief, the work should be taken altogether out of the hands of the Clergy. He should be sorry that any such idea should go forth. What he ventured to contend was, that the basis should be a secular one, and that the Clergy should be incorporated into the common system.

The Rev. EMILIUS BAYLEY, B.D.

MY CHRISTIAN FRIENDS,—When I sent in my card to ask permission to say a few words this evening, it was from having misunderstood, perhaps, what fell from Mr. Hill upon the subject before us. I do not know exactly what words he used, but I understood him to speak of the advisability of superseding the action of the Clergy in the organization of charitable relief. I think, however, that what was said has been well answered, so far as it bore hardly upon the Clergy. I think it was completely answered by the admirable paper which was read by my friend, Mr. Thorold, and also by the remarks which fell from the preceding speaker.

Speaking as one who has laboured in London for fourteen or fifteen years, and who laboured as a Layman before I thought of taking Orders, I am sure that it is from no wish on the part of the Clergy to monopolize this work, that so much of it has rested upon their shoulders. I would ask who, some ten, twenty, or thirty years ago, amongst the Laity were coming forward to organize and administer Charitable Relief upon a large scale? There may have been one or two who engaged in the work; but had it not been for the devoted labours of many of the London Clergy of that day, the organization of Charitable Relief in the metropolis would not have been in the position it is at this moment. We are exceedingly glad to find that many of the Laity are now feeling their responsibility in regard to this work. We do not want to monopolize it. We feel we have been called to do the work, and to the best of our ability we have done it; but there is much of the secular work done by the Clergy of the metropolis, which they would be thankful to roll on to the shoulders of their Lay brethren, if they find them ready to undertake it. This point, however, should be borne in mind in the consideration of any question of organizing on any extensive scale the Charitable Relief of the poor in London and in other large towns.

I think, first of all, that the Clergy have special knowledge available for the due administration of that special relief which goes far to constitute Christian Charity. Certainly the relieving officer knows a great many facts which may be unknown to us; but it is not always those cases that come under his knowledge which are most deserving of relief. There are many persons suffering greatly, who will never make their wants known to the relieving officer,—many persons in a somewhat better position in life than that of the absolutely poor, who do demand and have a loud claim upon our sympathy and our aid; and I would ask who are likely to know these persons except district visitors, scripture-readers, the Clergy, and the various agents in connection with the Clergy, who are in daily and habitual contact with these people? Then, again,—although, perhaps, it is not for a Clergyman to say so,—I believe there are a great many benevolent, and more or less wealthy, persons, who,—whether wisely or not I do not say,—place great confidence in the Clergy in the administration of their alms. They will give their money to them when they will not give it to other agencies. Now, is it for us to refuse to act as trustees in such distribution of alms? Possessing the knowledge, either at first or second hand, of every individual who is living in our parishes—because in all well-organized parishes the case of every person who will receive the visits of our agents and ourselves is visited regularly and systematically—and possessing the confidence of a large number of large-hearted Christian givers, I do not see that the time has yet come for altogether superseding the action of the Clergy in our large towns in the superintendence of the administration of this temporal relief.

There are many points which have been touched upon to-night with which I cordially concur. I cordially agree with what has been said concerning the baneful action of the Poor Law in spreading pauperism in this country. It is the great question—the great problem which we have to solve—How may we come to the succour of the needy without increasing pauperism? And, as has been said to-night, I do not think the statesman has yet arisen who can solve this question; for it is essentially a statesman's question: it is a question which demands knowledge of political economy; it is a question which demands knowledge of the condition and circumstances of our poorer classes; it is a question which demands Christian sympathy and Christian intelligence; and I should be very glad to see that man rise up who could really grapple with it, and preside successfully over an organization of the Charities of this country. There can be no question that the Poor Law has tended to increase pauperism. The Poor Law has a direct tendency to check that spirit of prudence and forethought which ought to animate all hearts. It has a direct tendency to interfere with the principle of mutual help and mutual assistance, which every one is glad to see developed amongst the poor as well as amongst the rich. I believe they are, as a rule, very glad and willing to help each other; but the tendency of the Poor Law, with its organized system of affording relief to all who demand its help, is at all events to check the action of that principle. There are other principles, also, which are interfered with through the operation of a compulsory Poor Law; but we have got the Poor Law, and I do not see how, after we have educated the people to confidence in that law, we can, by a sudden sweep, dispense with it altogether. You must make the best use you can of the materials at hand; you must make the best use you can of the knowledge possessed by the Clergy, district visitors, and others engaged in this good work; but do at the same time endeavour to provide a better organization than has yet existed, and then I think much may be done for the welfare and for the happiness of the poor classes in this country. Sure I am, it is a great question; sure I am, that it is a question which demands all our attention and all our thought, and that the future of this country is to a very great extent bound up in the solution which may be given to it in the course of the next few years.

But we should be thankful for what has been done in the past. We should recollect the agencies which have been successful in days gone by; and put our hand to the plough with a firm purpose of endeavouring, not to supersede what is good, but to supplement it by the aid and assistance which may be given by the Laity, as well as by the Clergy, throughout the land.

The Rev. Dr. Monsell, Rector of St. Nicholas, Guildford.

I think it is the duty of every one rising to address an assembly such as this, to bring any facts he may have gathered from his own experience, and scatter them among the many other facts of which mention has been made. I give simply the facts arising out of my experience of a few years in a country parish in Surrey, in order that I might support much of what has been said this evening, in regard to the manner in which we should endeavour to make the poor help themselves as the best means of their being helped. I entered that parish seventeen years ago, and I shall never forget the first occasion on which I was asked to witness the distribution of its Charities. I went a little later than I was invited to the room where they were to be distributed, and I was astonished to find myself passing through a crowd of hundreds of people, who came there, apparently as mere paupers, to receive a miserable dole—that miserable dole being at the very best one or two loaves and one or two pounds of meat. They were receiving none when I went there; but passing through them I went into an inner room, and there found all the chief officers of the parish—the churchwardens, past wardens, overseers, and various other officials—engaged on one of the most delightful luncheons that it was ever my delightful privilege to take part in, or I should rather say, part of. Sitting down, I ate as heartily as any one there, joining in the whole thing, because it was utterly impossible at such a moment to stop the system. Luncheon over, wine, brandy, and all the various little condiments of comfort were introduced; the tickets were then brought out, and a few hours more sufficed to clear away the wretched dole, taken home for a feast that night, of which there was but little pleasant trace or remembrance the following morning. However, when the memory of the flesh-pots had somewhat passed away, I let those about me know that if I then had any control, things should not be so again. I shall mention, by way of contrast, how I left the parish some months ago. We had large charities belonging to the parish, left by the bequests of good people in former days, who intended to do much more than the mismanagement in later days enabled them to accomplish. Large charities indiscriminately administered are a great means of pauperizing a parish. Means were devised for the furnishing of articles to the poor in the shape of blankets, coats, waistcoats, trousers, and so on; some were supplied with meat, some with wine, and some with groceries—indeed whatever was necessary. The original Bequest Charities of the parish bore one half of the cost, one fourth was contributed by the benevolent in the parish, and Molly Jones, or whoever wished to have the article, had to make up the other fourth herself. A pair of blankets cost, say, 10*s.*, and of this sum 5*s.* was made up from the old Parish Charities; some benevolent person in the parish bought the ticket for 2*s.* 6*d.*, and thus gave 7*s.* 6*d.* to the poor person, who could get the pair of blankets by adding 2*s.* 6*d.* from her own means. This system has been working for at least two years with admirable effect in my late parish; and I can say that in no one instance was any person left neglected by means of such distribution of Charity. The poor were encouraged to help themselves; and the rich were encouraged in good works likewise, because they were accustomed to make use of the old Bequest Charities of the parish which otherwise they would have had no power of controlling. Thus at least one third more was added to what was given, and the amount of good done in the parish was double that which it would otherwise have been. These Bequest Charities are no longer the curse in the parish which they were, but they are fruitful means of enabling the rich to be more bountiful; they diminish not by one particle what they give to each person, but on the contrary those who are disposed to give it can turn £5 into £15 worth of Charity, and by that means procure for the poor £20 worth of goods. And in no instance, except one, did I ever know a case where a poor person was slow to give the one-fourth to the Charity. On one occasion, when a poor woman was presented by me with a ticket for meat valued at 1*s.* 6*d.*, she asked, with a look of great poverty and wretchedness, whether she could not get 1*s.* 6*d.* worth. I told her with a hard face and stern voice, "No;" but casting her glance upon the kindlier influence of my wife, who happened to be standing by, sixpence was slipped into her hand before she left the place, and thus the difficulty was removed. This was the only instance in a large parish of upwards of 4000 people, that I know of, where one was obliged to supplement by any act of the kind the means which one had established for the benefit of the people. I am glad also to have the opportunity of saying something in answer to my excellent friend Mr. Portal with regard to his allusion to the cottages of the poor. No doubt he was thinking of the cottages of those who are poor in towns. The story was probably in his mind which some of us know, of the district visitor going into a poor house in London where every room was filled, not with one family, but with several; and where in one large room, he found five families—one in each corner and one in the centre. The visitor complaining to the person he was visiting of the inconvenience and enormous crowding, her answer was, "Oh, sir, it was not over-crowded before; there was no great inconvenience till the *gentleman* in the centre took in a lodger, and from that we have been crowded indeed." Such a state of things as that no doubt exists in great towns. But I cannot accept the statement that we cease to see those pleasant cottages for which England is I think distinguished, ornamented with the rose, and the woodbine, and the lily, and all those dear home-like flowers which adorn so many poor men's cottage homes, when I remember that the very last pageant I took part in, in connection with the parish of which I have been speaking, was the 20th anniversary of the Windsor Royal Association, founded by the great Prince Consort, at which the Queen gave away with her own hand prizes to hundreds. It was my lot to take into Windsor that day 130 people from my own parish, who had received either from her Majesty, or from her Royal husband, or from her Royal children, marks of their favour and approval, and that, not simply on account of the necessaries of life which they had procured honestly for themselves, but for the adornment and refinement and beauty which they had gathered round their homes. When I remember that great day, when I stood up and spoke to 1400 people who had all received such prizes (all dining together in one tent, to the door of which her Majesty came, to bid them kindly welcome, and to a large proportion of whom the Queen that day dispensed with her own hand her royal gifts, I do trust and believe—and I certainly will not be easily persuaded to the contrary, while I hope there are amongst us many who still hold it to be true—that all that beauty, all that quiet, homely comfort, which is such a softener of the sorrows of life, has not yet passed away from the cottages of our country poor.

The Rev. C. H. Rice, Rector of Cheam.

We have spent so much time this evening in the crowded back-streets of London, that a little more country air will do us good. It is of the country I have to speak. Up to the last minute no allusion has been made to what is the great want and the great misery of our agricultural poor—their cottages. It is my lot to live in a parish where there are many Lady-Bountifuls; where there are between eighty and ninety pounds a-year of charitable endowments for a population of about 1500; and where it is my duty almost every day to restrain the tide of charitable help from demoralizing and ruining the place. And yet we want a great deal. Having heard this afternoon about Lay co-operation and the readiness of the Laity to offer it, I earnestly entreat it now. I am speaking now in the presence of many of the Laity of both sexes, who can do much. I invite them to bring public opinion to bear upon this subject. I invite every one in his own parish—the Laity especially—to inquire, and make it his business to know, how his poor neighbours are housed. You don't know at present, and if you did you would be horrified. Mine are certainly exceptional circumstances, but not very rare ones,—nearly all the cottages in my parish belonging to small proprietors. There is want of air, want of water, and want of drainage; and I find no available means of bringing the law to bear—having no board of health to interfere as in large towns. Here is a wide field of usefulness open to hundreds and thousands, and if they only make a few inquiries they will find that field close before them. It has been said that it is our great duty to help the poor to help themselves, and that is the principle upon which I myself have been working by the ordinary means of a clothing and coal club, with the aid of such institutions as a garden flower show and the like which I found existing. And I would refer for a moment to the subject of benefit clubs. I speak as one perhaps not much acquainted with political economy, and would gladly feel that it is not for me to study the subject and say what is to be done. But I am sure we Clergy ought to be put, by thousands of our Lay friends, in a position either to establish good benefit clubs, or else to recommend the poor to those already existing, as being on a sure basis. Within three years I have come across many cases of men who, in their old age, after having regularly subscribed to a benefit club, have been cast adrift by its failure; and it has been our rule to make those who have been thus disappointed, in their attempts to be provident and to supply their own wants in their time of need, the recipients of the Endowed Charities. I merely throw out the hint. Perhaps the best use one can make of a Congress like the present, is to state facts and give the results of one's own experience. I shall therefore add one remark upon the want of work. Last winter not a single able-bodied man in my parish received parochial relief, although on one day when I met the relieving officer he had relieved 140 able-bodied men in the two adjoining parishes. This was done by means of a labour test, and deducting for any *bonâ fide* produce of the labour, at a cost of less than £25 in ten weeks. It was not impossible in a small parish thus to help the poor to help themselves. Every able-bodied man who went to the relieving-officer was sent on to me for employment, and every one so sent I employed. (A voice—How?) Well, it was hard work. When I was without resources, I sent messages and letters which otherwise might have gone by post to distances of a few miles. Then I had a pile of books to send a distance of five miles, and I sent them one by one on successive days by different messengers. In short I *made* work as far as my ingenuity would enable me; and when I was at my wits' end I was told of some stumps of trees which landlord and tenant would be glad to have rooted up and cleared away. They were cut up, and brought down to my own premises, and valued and sold for firewood. I will just add one remark as to the relief of vagrants, which I think sometimes occasions the country Clergy much difficulty. I have never given a halfpenny to a man I did not know; I believe it would be a blunder and a crime to do so. I send my card down to the station-master with an order to send the bearer by such a train to such a place at my expense. Not more than half those whom I have thus relieved after close inquiries ever go to the station; the other half are never heard of any more, amongst whom are most of those to whom my heart has been most tender.

The Rev. T. H. Clark, Clifton.

My apology for coming before you is, that we have heard much from representatives of the metropolis and country places, but I live in the suburbs of a large provincial city where we are just about to establish, or have already, I believe, established, a Society for the Organization of Relief. I came to-night hoping to hear more than we have done about the very subject on the paper, as to how such a Society has worked in the metropolis, and how it is likely to work in provincial towns; because it is only, I believe, in the metropolis and in large towns such as this, that it could be established. As far as I understand, an office is opened in which you have a list of all who receive Parish Relief, and a list of the recipients of any Charities. Many old cities abound in Charities. This would also be an office in which inquiry could be made of any persons of whom you do not know much; and it may be the means of bringing the Clergy and the Nonconformists into communication with reference to some of the poor. There may be some poor people who go to church in the morning and chapel at night, and so get from both. And anything which may enable us to communicate one with the other in regard to the poor must be important. It may also be a channel of communication with the Poor Law Board. It may likewise be a sort of office where men out of work could apply for employment; at all events, there may be some register there by which the Clergy may be put into the way of obtaining work for those who come to them. I do not think we must expect too much at first from these Societies for the Organization of Relief. Still, at the same time, they cannot fail to do much good, directly or indirectly; and if they only lead people to feel that care is being taken to detect imposture—if those who give are led to know this, and if the poor also know that we wish to deal fairly with all, we shall feel that such Societies have not been established in vain. Where there are not such Societies, the next best thing is a Mendicity Society, which can not only help those travelling in search of work and detect rogues, but can afford assistance to some of the deserving poor as is done in the city to which I belong. As a clergyman, I feel much indebted to any gentlemen who establish such Societies as this, and so relieve us from the burden of getting information about and helping a mass of persons with whom we have nothing to do. We have enough to do to look after our own communicants—the people who come to our places of worship—the people of whom we know something. But when all think they are at liberty to come to us, and expect us to give them assistance, I think any such central office, where an inquiry could be made to help us in any way to know the real state of the poor, and what other agencies may be at work to assist them, would be a great boon. In Paris, where there is much vanity and dissipation, and where we should think the poor were little cared for, ladies and gentlemen go forth in great numbers early in the morning, between seven and eight o'clock, to visit the poor. They do not leave many tickets, they do not give much money; but they are able to refer the cases needing relief to such a central office as we wish to establish, and they are sure to be nvestigated. There is no time to be lost in attempting to grapple with the subject of relieving the poor in the most judicious manner. I believe a great many members of Parliament—Mr. Samuel Morley and others—are deeply interested in the question. I have much to do with Emigration, and I have much sympathy with those working in this matter. We read of the great amount of destitution in the metropolis, and of the deaths occasioned thereby; but there are a large number who die, upon whom no coroner's inquest is held, simply because death is supposed to have resulted from natural causes. I think we should seek, by every means in our power, to help on the Organization of Relief, and secure the assistance of the Laity as far as we can in dealing with the masses of our poor.

C. L. Higgins, Esq.

I cannot express with what deep interest I have listened to all that has been said to-night, hoping, as I did, to get some practical hints which might be of value to me in my own county. After what has been said about the working of the Poor Law Board, I feel almost afraid to tell you that for thirty-three years I have been Chairman of a Board of Guardians. During that time I have, of course, seen a good deal of the working of the Poor Law system as carried out in practice, and I am sorry to confess that the charges brought against it here are true. I shall not think it necessary to enter into detail now. There is only one thing which I wish to mention, and that is the subject of Benefit Societies. I believe that they are pretty generally distributed about the country, and a great advantage they are, and have been, when they are rightly and judiciously established. The Union, to which I have the honour to belong, takes in forty-five parishes, and embraces more than one third of one of the midland counties of England. Throughout the whole of that district, it has been the practice of the Board of Guardians to supplement the payment from the Benefit Club by a small relief from the funds of the Poor Law Union; and the result has been, the almost entire destruction of that feeling of honest independence which used to be more or less characteristic of the English labourer. It is said, and truly, that it is right to help those who try to help themselves; but this should be done in the way of finding them work and paying them fairly for it, and not by affording them pecuniary relief, and so in reality by pauperizing them. I believe that scarcely anything has done more to injure the working man than indiscriminate pecuniary relief. Boards of Guardians do not get many thanks from anybody. A poor man in my neighbourhood whom I knew very well, and who had reduced himself from comparative affluence to the most grievous destitution by drunkenness, said to me some time ago (he had applied for relief in consequence of his miserable condition), "I understand that you are the Chairman of the Board, and you are the worst of them all. What do you mean by giving me 2*s.* 6*d.* and a loaf a week?" I replied that he had only himself to maintain, and that 2*s.* 6*d.* a week was as much as he could expect. "I could have earned that before breakfast the greater part of my life," was the rejoinder. I said, "You ought to be ashamed to acknowledge it, and to be in the condition in which you now are." "I'll tell you," he replied, "how you ought all of you to be served. You ought to be served as Jehu served the priests of Baal, when he gave orders to go in and slay them all."

The Rev. R. Allen, Vicar of Christ Church, Gipsy Hill.

I may as well say I am not a self-appointed speaker, my name having been given in without my concurrence: but a friend thought I might give some account of the way in which the newly-organized Mendicity Societies are working in the neighbourhood of London. I am thankful to say, that the Upper Norwood and Crystal Palace District Society is working satisfactorily. It has accomplished a considerable amount of work, and the people themselves readily support it, because they know that the matter will be carried out by a Committee of themselves; and if we can only get Laymen to form these Committees, and get work of this kind out of the hands of the Clergy, it would be a great boon. Our Mendicity Society sends tickets gratuitously to every house in the place, indeed any respectable person may have them on application. The inhabitants are requested never to give relief, but tickets only. One effect has been to clear the roads of Upper Norwood of tramps. These tramps have been known to go and stop ladies in the road, and almost threaten them with personal violence if they did not relieve them. By the system upon which this Society has been worked, this disgraceful state of things has been entirely altered. The ticket secures immediate relief of really necessitous cases, and at the same time the beggar receives an intimation that he must not prosecute his vocation in Norwood, and that if he does he will run the risk of being taken into custody as a vagrant. The Society, which employs an experienced Charity Officer, also dispenses a large amount of relief to the sick and indigent poor of the neighbourhood, during the winter, when employment is scarce and poverty most abounds.

The CHAIRMAN,—My task has been an easy one, as there has been room for all the speakers who have sent in their cards. I think, though the time is not quite up, that after the long sittings we have had to-day it will be best for us to have the meeting dismissed. I will call upon the Bishop of Madras to give the blessing.

The BISHOP OF MADRAS then pronounced the Benediction, and the meeting closed.

THURSDAY MORNING, 13th OCTOBER.

The Right Rev. THE PRESIDENT took the Chair at Ten o'clock.

THE EVIDENCE OF CHRISTIAN ANTIQUITY AS TO CHURCH RITUAL.

The Venerable Archdeacon FREEMAN, Exeter, read the following paper.

THE object of such a paper, no less than of such a Congress as this, is, as I understand it, a practical one. We do not meet here to accumulate facts or develope views for their mere interest's sake, but for the sake of their bearing upon that which is so near and dear to us all—the well-being of God's Church in our land. All truth is, indeed, as one has wisely said, sure to be wanted some time or other; but it is not all wanted at one time. And at the present moment, emphatically, we want just so much as bears upon the present hour: we have no time for more. I shall not, therefore, dream of laying before you a complete *conspectus* of the "Evidence of Christian Antiquity as to Church Ritual;" but such a one, rather, as shall embrace the largest number of points of present and emergent importance. Let it be understood, too, that on this subject it is simply impossible to say anything new: to adduce, that is, any fact of Church antiquity heretofore unknown. No ecclesiastical Rosetta-stone or Moabite inscription has come to light; nor if there had, is it likely that it would modify in any important respect our conception of the ritual condition of the Early Church. We know pretty nearly all that we are ever likely to know about it. And that knowledge, moreover, owing to the events of late years, is widely diffused among us. We have all of us heard something in our day about Church Ritual:—

> Omnia jam vulgata—Quis aut Eurysthea durum,
> Aut illaudati nescit Busiridis aras?

Who knows not of the Herculean labour imposed on the English Church in this matter—the controversies that, by a sad necessity of these latter days, have raged round the altar of God and the Sacrament of peace and love? And what corner of antiquity has not been ransacked in the course of the inquiry? What stone has been left unturned that might perchance serve to buttress contending views of the Church's ritual mind? Who can hope to add anything to the stores of ritual learning piled, for the defence or the attack, round Eucharistic doctrine, or the "Ornaments Rubric"? No; there is nothing *new* to be said on the subject, certainly. But a great deal that is old and true has yet to be applied, in practice, to the matter in hand. For it is one thing to know a fact, and quite another to apply it. And it is to an honest and fearless application of ancient ritual fact to the solution of modern ritual questions that, not now for the first time, though for the first time in such an arena, I invite the Church of this country. That this has not been done yet, I fearlessly assert. Now, as ever, in ritual as in morals, men select out of antiquity, or out of the sober verity of things, what suits their own notions or school, and reject the rest. There is in the human mind a wonderful and most unfortunate capacity for what we may call *selective absorption*. All unconsciously it imbibes with avidity facts of one colour or complexion, while it is marvellously blind or stolid to all the rest; as much so as if they did not exist at all. To this must be attributed the strange and totally opposite travesties of ancient ritual practice which abound among us;—travesties which would be ludicrous if they concerned a less serious matter, and astonishing were they not so perfectly familiar. On this account,—I mean because a simple statement of the facts must of necessity offend the prejudices, and condemn the practices, of many here present, on the one side and on the other,—I feel that I have need to bespeak your patient and candid hearing of what I have to say.

Reminding you, then, that the English Church, and we as her members, profess to be guided by the Evidence of Antiquity in all essentials of worship, I proceed to state to you what that evidence, in its main outlines, is.

But let me premise that, viewing the subject as I do, and as I think you will agree with me in viewing it, I confess to some degree of awe in approaching it. For it is not as if we were inquiring after the practice of any other age than the earliest. That might be a useful inquiry; but this is no less than a very solemn one. All creations and first beginnings of things are awing and solemnizing to contemplate.

And the ritual of Apostolic days was a revelation. It came down from Heaven. Nor only so. The observance of that ritual, in its grand and leading features, is as necessary to the scheme of salvation, as the holding of sacred doctrine and the practice of holiness. Those are *qualifications* for Heaven; but if we ask for the medium of contact, the link of union, the ladder of access, between heaven and earth, we know of no other than the ritual and sacramental ordinances of the Gospel, as once for all instituted. They alone formally, and as a matter of Divine order, knit us up into the Body of Christ, and hold us to it. But while this consideration is a solemnizing, it is also a guiding one. It puts us in the true attitude for discerning what we are in search of. It must always be good to tread softly, and with veiled and downcast eyes, in searching holy ground. And in the earlier stage of this inquiry, we are searching out that mysterious region of time, from the great Pentecostal Revelation onwards, when Worship, no less than Faith, was divinely ordered and "confirmed by signs following;" a time when Apostles and Prophets delivered to the Church, not their own conceptions or arrangements, but that which also "they had received."

What, then, was the substance, so far as we can separate it roughly from the accidents, of Church Ritual in those primeval days? A brief outline of it has been left us in the Acts of the Apostles. When the movement of the Spirit on the darkness of the Church's deep created "a new thing" out of that which before was "without form and void," what was that new thing? What shaping and awakening to a new kind of life did the mere "prayer" of the "upper chamber" at Jerusalem (Acts i. 14) receive? What was the settled form of things which was in substance to abide till the end of the world? "They continued steadfastly" in something. What was it? It was, 1st, *The Apostles' Teaching and Fellowship;* and 2nd, *the Breaking of Bread;* and 3rd, *the Prayers.* To these if we add, 4thly, "the continuing daily in the Temple" for the high service of *Psalmody*, we have, I conceive, a full statement, in block or outline, of Apostolic Ritual. Nor, I think we must admit, does the rest of the New Testament, taken by itself, fill out with much certainty or fulness this draught of Service. It is only when we take in the evidence of the next, or sub-Apostolic period, that we are enabled to gather what *must have been*, in many particulars, the Apostolic usage. Yet let us notice, that on every one of these four great elements of Ritual—the Teaching, the Holy Eucharist, the Prayers, and the Psalmody—we are furnished with some, though few, details. At the celebration at Troas, "Paul is long preaching": —the Epistles are ordered to be read in all the Churches, and attention to such "reading" is enjoined on ministers (1 Tim. iv. 13):—the reading of Moses and the Prophets in the synagogues every Sabbath-day (the eve of the Christian Lord's-day) is dwelt on as a regular source of religious instruction (Acts xv. 21):—books are mentioned in liturgical or ministerial context (2 Tim. iv. 11; cf. vv. 5, 11). So, again, an officiating vestment is *possibly* spoken of: the context at large, and the earnestness of the entire passage, seeming to countenance the supposition (Ibid.).*

---

* Mr. Marriott's learned researches do not dispose of the considerations arising from the *context*. Why send a message about a mere cloak and book, in the midst of an earnest injunction about ministerial work? See his "Vestiarium Christianum." App. c. 17–21.

The breaking of bread, again, was manifestly the high *weekly* occasion of assembly and offertory :—"the Altar" is surely attested. A Eucharistic or consecrating prayer, though variable, seems to be testified to (1 Cor. xiv. 16). Light was used with some profusion (Acts. xx. 8), perhaps with a mystical significance; and, in later Apostolic days, in mystical number (Rev. i. 12). There is a curious concurrence of literary and monumental evidence in favour of some kind of headdress having been worn by Apostles in celebrating. (See Marriott, "Vestiarium Christianum," xli. 38-41, and appendix B.) The Prayers, again, are enjoined to be made in detail for all degrees of men,—for kings (1 Tim. ii. 2), captives, sufferers (Heb. xiii. 3), clergy (Ibid. 7); including, perhaps, thankful remembrance of such as had passed away from the earth. And special places were set apart for Divine service (1. Cor. xi. 22); at Jerusalem, apparently, somewhere "without the gate"; a supposition, which adds much point to certain exhortations of St. Paul (Heb. xiii. 11–15). And psalms and hymns accompanied the Eucharist (Eph. v. 19, 20).

Thus far, then, of the Ritual of the Apostolic age. And when we enter on the sub-Apostolic, as witnessed to by literature and monuments, what we discern is an orderly expansion, and reduction to detail, of these same features of service. The temple and synagogue elements of Psalmody, and of reading of the Holy Scriptures, are fully conserved and developed in the preliminary offices on the great Christian Festival. The Apostolic Constitutions prescribe the most ample reading: the ancient liturgy of St. James embodies a very large measure of it in the Office itself. Other Churches, judging from the practice of later days, throw back the reading, except the Epistle and Gospel, to the previous Offices. The Psalms were, as a rule, thrown back further still, and commenced the entire act of worship on the Sunday. Yet the very ancient Armenian Communion Office embodied the Psalms in its very structure. The Eucharistic Office itself, in detail, it need not be said, now emerges to view. And from the testimony of the earliest post-apostolic authorities downwards, no less than from the contents of the Liturgies, the great features of oblation of a memorial sacrifice,—of reception of mysterious and sacrificial food,—of effectual pleading and presenting of the One Great Sacrifice,—are discerned throughout. That the consecrated elements were held to *be*, in a profound mystery, the Body and Blood of Christ, to all purposes of real participation, no one who honestly studies Antiquity can deny. And the full and large intercessions and giving of thanks, which everywhere, as in Apostolic days, accompany the rite, abundantly testify to the mighty powers attached to it, for pleading for the whole Church, and presenting it to God in Christ.

As to accessories, of course they come very largely into view in this period, as compared with the Apostolic. It seems to be fairly established that a comely garment, and of the kind that was held to befit solemn occasions, was in use from very early times (Marriott, p. 27); and also that a vestment of more especial solemnity was put on, at the point where the ordinary service merged into the more solemn Eucharistic one *λαμπρὰν ἐσθῆτα μετενδύς* (Lit. Clem.). Yet *white* seems to have been for a long time the only colour; fine linen the only material (Marriott, *ibid.*); except that a band, possibly coloured, but more commonly black, held exactly the position of our stole. The exact date or origin of the subsequently universal alb, stole, and chasuble, is lost in obscurity. But the retention of these vestments, linen or silken, but white, with only so much addition of colour as the varying stole and orphreys according to the season involve, would certainly bring us most nearly into harmony at once with early times and with the whole Church. A distinctive dress for the Holy Communion we ought, in any case, to secure.

But now, to draw this statement to a close, and apply it to present questions among us. What was, I would ask, the *purpose* of the whole of this divinely-prescribed ritual? It was, surely, by processes covering the whole of our being and needs, and pervading, by a solemn weekly recurrence, our whole time, "to present every man faultless in Christ Jesus." It was not, as we have allowed ourselves too long to think, merely to give a fillip three times a year, or once a month, to a languid religious circulation; or to impart a month's provision of spiritual meat, as to some dull hybernating animal. No :—Sacrifice—presentation of an alert and vigorous life in weekly-renewed union to the one all-vivifying Sacrifice—this, and no less than this, was the aim of all Service, Eucharistic or ordinary. But a cord, to be kept strictly or even approximately straight, must, we know, be supported at very short intervals. But a system of monthly Eucharists is like nothing else in the world than those nominally straight, but in reality feebly earthward-curving telegraph wires, which weary the eye of the railway traveller as he flashes along on his journey. Such long intervals of Communion cannot sustain us at the true spiritual level. A Church, or a parish, without weekly Eucharists, has yet to set up the warp for the woof of its Christianity. For such, any observance, for example, of Saints' days, seasons, or the like accessory helps to holiness, is in reality putting on the fringe without the garment.

But as the Early Church, for hundreds of years, knew nothing of "the new moons"—that is, of monthly Eucharists—so neither did she know anything of what I venture, with all deference, to call *starved* Eucharists. The Eucharist, as originally constituted—as it existed throughout the world for seven hundred years, and as it theoretically and by rule exists still,—was, as we have seen, a provision for the *whole man:* his understanding,—his instinct of praise,—his need of manifold intercession; and, not merely for his need of a deep mystery of sacrificial Communion. The Church of the first ages never dreamed of a Sunday Eucharist, which had not, bound up in closest union with it,—and as a rule, preceding it,—large reading of Holy Scripture, abundant psalmody, full and detailed intercession and supplication. The existing Eastern Liturgies, with their preceding offices;—the Western Rite, ere it was miserably shorn of its Lessons, Psalmody, Canticles, and Litany, by the disuse of the Breviary in public;—and finally, the existing law of both East and West, that the Offices, as far as Lauds inclusive, *must* precede the Eucharistic, were it only overnight;—these are my witnesses.

But what is offered to us now, as the acme of spiritual perfection, and the proper instrument of it? Even on the high weekly Festival an early and isolated act of oblation and reception, from which these grand features of large Scriptural teaching, praise, and intercession, are excluded by the utterly illegal deferring (I refer to universal Church law, and to our own, fairly interpreted) of the Ordinary Office and Litany to a later period of the day. The grand rite ordained by Christ, and settled for ever in all its great features by His Apostles, is thus reduced to one which, however lofty its work, as far as it goes, does not provide for the *whole* man, but leaves three-fourths of his being uncared for, or thrust into a corner, as if of secondary moment. Instead of a complex act fitted to its complex nature, we have one which feeds and developes abnormally a single organ of it, to the atrophy of all the rest. And when to this is added, what is unhappily now advocated as the equally good, if not even the more excellent way, the forbearing that reception of the sacrificial Food, to which the whole ordinance leads up,—when the Eucharistic exhortation to charity, the analogue of the ancient kiss of peace, is regularly omitted, and the time spent in the washing of cups and patens, concerning which, however reverently intended, we certainly "have no commandment from the Lord,"—then I know not what else to call the residuum but a *starved* Eucharist, such as cannot rightly feed a soul, and such as the Early Church never heard of. (See Scudamore: *Communion of the Faithful.*) The plea on which this vast departure from primitive practice is defended, is the duty of receiving fasting; concerning which, again, however reverent, we have no commandment, nor any proof of it as a custom for the first two hundred years, while Apostolic it certainly cannot have been. Nor is one favourite plea for non-reception, viz., previous reception on the same day, at all better founded. There is no trace earlier than the 7th century, and no distinct injunction earlier than the 12th, of such a prohibition: while the present Roman Church, actually *requires* a second participation in the day by the celebrant, in the form of the ablutions; and the English Church enjoins the same, if any of the Elements be left, on the communicants also. In minor points too, those who undertake to be our leaders are leading us astray. "Leavened bread" has indeed a slight and superficial appearance of fitness for Eucharistic purposes. But it was not that which the Lord commanded, or the Apostles partook of (See *Principles of Divine Service*, vol. ii., pp. 272, 302). The nature of the ordinance, which in the case of both elements elevates our common food and drink into channels of spiritual benefit, added to the unwavering practice of the Eastern Church, and the late origin of the dispute about azymes (See Neale's *Eastern Church*), is conclusive on this point.

Nor,—profoundly and fully as the ancient Church recognises the Presence of Our Lord, as our High-Priest, in all ordinances, but supremely in this, to consecrate the elements, and identify them with His own Body and Blood, as offered at the Last Supper and on the Cross,—does she anywhere offer a single prayer to Him as impanate and invinate for our sakes, as well as Incarnate. Our proffered guides are as much at fault in what they *add* to the ancient rite, as in what they take away.

Happily, amidst these divergences to the right and left, the course of duty and peace lies open to us; the ὁδὸς, the path of observances steadily maintained by the Early and United Church of God. "The Evidence of Christian Antiquity as to Church Ritual" is not in the slightest degree doubtful or conflicting.

Men may hear, or they may forbear,—but the trumpet gives no uncertain sound. "Quod ubique, quod ab omnibus observatum est," in the matter of Ritual, for five hundred years, be this our "semper observandum"—*Τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἔθη κρατείτω.*

The PRESIDENT here said:—

UP to this time I think we may every one of us trace that there has been amongst us in this large gathering of men who differ much upon many points that we are discussing a remarkable spirit of peace and of mutual forbearance. I trust we may trace this to the blessed presence of the Spirit of Peace. I feel that a great strain upon the patience of many in this room may result from the discussion of this morning, and in some of the manifestations during Archdeacon Freeman's speech I saw cause for some alarm as to the future of our discussion. I would venture, therefore, once more to ask this, that if in either the reading of a paper or in speaking upon it, the reader or speaker is conscious himself that he is adding a little epigrammatic force to what he says by putting in words which, while they do not add to the argument, may occasionally provoke those who view the truth he is setting before the brethren in a different aspect, he will exercise a little self-denial, and leave out the *purpureus pannus.* It would be a real act of brotherly kindness; it would be a real act of charity. There are differences amongst us,—we do not disguise it. We want to weigh them carefully, one with the other, in the sight of God. Nothing can hinder that so much as provocation on the one side which is sure to lead to reprisals on the other; and so, the Spirit of Peace being gone, the search after truth is lost at once. As Chairman, of course I can do nothing; but I venture to throw myself upon the hearers first of all, because they may try the speaker, and upon the speakers next, because they can very easily provoke the hearers; and I ask you all, while you withhold nothing which you consider essential to the truth, to withhold everything which you think calculated to offend.

Mr. J. ELLIOTT, Bassett, Southampton, read the following paper:

THE question of ritual turns on the nature of God and the position of man in relation to his Maker. We learn from God's word that the human race was designed to be one family under the Almighty Father, and that by reason of the fall this relationship was suspended; but the inspired authors of the Scriptures, old and new, speak as with one tongue in predicting and proclaiming the restoration of man to the family status as the object and effect of Christ's mission and work.

The Church of England, in her sixth article, sends us all to the Bible as the only real standard of doctrine, and, therefore, the only authoritative guide to Ritual.

The Scriptures "contain all things necessary to salvation," inclusive of those outward services which God ever has required, or ever will require of man. The Bible does more than this,—it predicts the rise and specifies the nature of that corrupt system and service by which "the simplicity that is in Christ" would be overlaid by the complexity that is in Satan.

If Paul is worthy of belief, the circle of evidence in his day was complete, absolutely "compassed about with a great cloud of witnesses," and he puts the pertinent question,—"What need have we of further witnesses?"

Dr. Pusey writes—"It is no great strain on the modesty of the nineteenth century to credit those living in the second with knowing something about their religion." The modesty would surely be more to the purpose, which credited those who walked by Christ's side, and were especially instructed by Him, with knowing His views and with leaving us a complete and intelligible account of them.

Besides, no others have ever since received, or are ever likely to receive, such a testimony to their trustworthiness as He gave in the memorable words, "I thank Thee, O Father, that of those whom Thou hast given to be with Me, not one of them is lost, save the son of perdition."

It is, then, no great assumption to include the evidence of Christ and His chosen twelve in the category of "Christian antiquity."

It is impossible to doubt that they speak as with one voice in declaring the abolition of caste distinction, and in laying down rules for Christian service in direct antagonism to sacerdotalism.

How clearly the primitive Christians understood this, is proved by the indisputable fact that they, always and everywhere, not only repudiated the use of temples—a class of structure, never designed for social worship and never so used, or capable of such employment—but adopted a totally opposite principle of arrangement, destructive of all notions of caste distinction.

If we take the further fact that these old witnesses to the truth have been deliberately falsified, since the ninth century, with the object of converting them into mock temples, and that no Church, as part of its original construction, ever contained, before the ninth century, any screen or imitation of a holy of holies, Virgin Mary niche, altar, saint chapel, confessional, or any single thing or feature significant of sacerdotal views, we shall reach the fact that all "Christian antiquities," whose voice is worth anything in the controversy, speak as with one tongue in favour of public family service, and against all sacerdotal rituals.

It is true that great changes from the original Christian ideal in thought and speech existed long before the ninth century; but they are not borne out by one single antiquarian fact.

Living, as they did, in an atmosphere of Paganism, it is very easy to account for early writers talking about altars and temples; but the real point at issue is—how came the primitive Christians to discard the use of such things for nine centuries, and disuse even the names for the first three centuries?

The ancient schoolmen engaged in an elaborate argument to determine how many angels could dance on the point of a needle. They assumed the point to exist; but in Church antiquities, even the one point is wanting on which to base priestly pretensions, or to found a sacerdotal ritual.

Dr. Newman admits that the use of Temples, incense, lamps, and candles, holy water, holy days, calendars, processions, turning to the east, sacerdotal vestments, and the introduction of images, "are all of Pagan origin, sanctified by their adoption into the Church."

"Confiding in the power of Christianity to resist the infection of evil, and to transmute the very instruments and appendages of demon-worship to an evangelical use, the rulers of the Church adopted, or imitated, or sanctioned the existing rites."

Solomon says that there is nothing new under the sun. Certainly the story is a very old one, of the conscientious Jew, whose belief in the virtues of pork was equalled by his faith in the efficacy of baptism, and who never ventured to partake of the one without performing the other, and thus managed to reconcile his lust with his creed by converting forbidden swine into orthodox mutton.

Dr. Newman is undoubtedly right in ascribing a Pagan origin to the things he names, but he is unquestionably wrong in attributing their introduction to the fourth century; and it is an extraordinary omission on his part not to have told us that the materialistic notions, which required these things to illustrate them, came also from demonology, and have nothing whatever to do with theology.

When reproached by their pagan neighbours with having no proper ritual appendages, the early Christians replied in the well-known words, "altars and shrines have we none."

It is true that St. Paul says, "We have an altar whereof they have no right to eat which serve the Tabernacle;" but Paul's especial task was to prove the realization of the old material shadows in the revealed spiritual facts; and his clear meaning is, that Christ's Divine nature was the altar on which, as man, His sacrifice was accepted by God, and that they have no right to any nourishment from this spiritual food who adhere to sacerdotalism. "If ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing." The retention of any vestige of caste was in Paul's eyes nothing but rank infidelity.

This further fact is to be gleaned from Christian antiquities, that the men who, previous to becoming Christian, had no conception of religion, save as connected with altars and sacrifices, temples, and priests clad in sacerdotal vestments bearing significant names, wrenched themselves off at once from all these things, including that one of all others, perhaps the most difficult for officers of any kind to relinquish, a distinctive garment. It is an historical fact that Christian ministers always appeared in Church, as out of it, in the ordinary garb of the day and of the civil class to which they belonged, and that such garments have only become distinctive to ministers by the people adopting newer fashions.

It was the ancient custom in Italy for the people to wear a shirt as the outer garment, and from its colour it was nicknamed "Alb." The modern Italians use the slang word "red," to distinguish the shirt worn by Garibaldi's followers. The Dalmatic was a shirt with long sleeves.

As many of the first Christian officers were taken from the rural population, they wore their smock frocks in Church, and retained its old pet name of "my little house," the meaning of the word "chasuble."

The surplice was an over garment, worn by a higher class. The pall is the modern representative of the old pallium, a woollen comforter.

The rochet is simply a hunting-coat. The mediæval bishops, who rode well to hounds and did not like to be behind-hand in the fashions of their hunting brethren, wore like them on their rochets, the scarfs of their favourite lady-loves, and thus added the cymar, or chimere, to the ecclesiastical wardrobe.

The black robe is an academical distinction; and the unfortunate pretenders to priestly powers are thus reduced to the lamentable necessity of discharging their assumed sacerdotal functions in garbs which are simply so many labels to ticket them as shams.

The Temple, so far as it was a covered structure, used ritualistically, consisted of two chambers; the outer one, the sanctuary, being only large enough to contain the officiating priests; the inner one, the holy of holies, separated from the former by a veil, was a small dark cell.

The brazen sea and the altar of sacrifice, stood outside the Temple, within the priests' court; outside of that was the enclosure for the chosen people; and outside of all was the court for the Gentiles.

Even the chosen people were only permitted to see through the gates what was done for them and without them, and to "beat upon their breasts, saying, Verily our God is a God that hideth Himself."

The only one of pagan Rome's four hundred Temples ever converted into a Church was the Pantheon, itself an anomaly, due to the Broad Temple notions of the heathens of the day, who built it to accommodate all the gods, and thus made it suitable in arrangement for a meeting-hall for Christ's kings.

There is no exception to the fact that, when free to choose a model, the primitive Christians adopted in the most literal manner that of the Basilica, or Roman town-hall, a building in which the Roman freemen met for public business.

At one end of this hall was a slightly raised platform, on which the president of the meeting sate; and at its edge was a low railing, the Latin name for which was *cancelli*.

As the president always appeared behind this railing, the free-and-easy mobs of the day nicknamed him and his platform "cancelli," meaning in the one case the man behind the railing, in the other the railed-in space; and thus originated in all the languages in Europe the terms "chancellor" and "chancel." The more decorous Greeks called the platform by its literal name, "bema."

In the Christian basilica the Bishop, or other presiding officer, occupied a chancel platform, copied exactly from the one used in the civil basilica.

The chancel had thus no connection whatever, in name, origin, or use, with the Communion Service; and for the first six centuries the table stood in the centre of the basilica, or meeting hall, in the midst of the people, who sat, or reclined around the table where the rite, so significant in its simple original institution of the family ideal service, was administered.

As the notion of a sacerdotal priest without a material sacrifice was a rank absurdity to Jew or pagan, the subtle longing to be the one, was accompanied by the equally subtle propensity to materialize the spiritual nature of the Lord's Supper, in order to obtain the other.

The time does not admit of tracing step by step the stealthy process by which the people were gradually deprived of the original kingly greatness conferred by Christ, till they found themselves at last, like the Jews while under God's displeasure, looking through a screen into a mock holy of holies at what was done, for them and without them —priests' serfs, instead of Christ's freedmen.

Inspired pens record that God is a consuming fire to all iniquity, and that all His attributes unite in the fact that He is "Love."

It is evident, therefore, that He tolerates no shade of evil, because He desires the perfect happiness of all His creatures, which can only be attained by obedience to His laws; and thus, "in His presence only is there fulness of joy."

It is then in mercy that God averts His face from the sinner, till atonement be made for the sin.

It is clear, therefore, that the ritual appointed for the "ministration of condemnation" must be essentially different from the service designed for the day of reconciliation.

God bases His throne on judgment and righteousness; "All His works are done in truth and equity."

He gives us the only boundary of His power, the only limit to His will. He says, "I cannot lie." "I form the light and create darkness; I make peace and create evil."

He cannot, consistently with His attributes, give birth to the one, without leaving the possibility of existence to the other.

He sets the boundary by His unerring judgment of all that is reasonable and good; and the slightest overstepping of that line is folly and evil.

He binds Himself by the laws He imposes on His creatures, and says, "Be ye holy, for I am holy."

He cannot create a reasoning being equal to Himself; the very condition of creation is therefore a liability to err.

He cannot bestow senses on man and call on him to reject their evidence, for "God is not a mocker," to invite men to "bring forth their strong reasons," and then tell them to believe "black to be white," or "bread to be flesh;" for, says God, "it is your reasonable service that I require." "God is so pure that the heavens are not clean in His sight, and He chargeth even His angels with folly." "He looked down from heaven to see if there were any that did understand, but they are altogether gone astray; there is none that doeth good, no not one." "Even the just man falleth seven times a day."

Therefore, God mercifully at once "concluded all under the law of sin, that as in Adam all die, for that all have sinned, so in Christ might all be made alive."

The scheme of redemption is thus based on God's foreknowledge that all men would wilfully fail in obedience to laws designed solely for their good; and Christ therefore came as a man, "made in all points like unto us, sin only excepted," to demonstrate the possibility of fulfilling all those laws; and having thus vindicated God's goodness and wisdom in making them, then to enable Him to reconcile His justice with His mercy, in suspending the direct operation of the law that "without shedding of blood there is no remission of sin," by placing the penalty on the One Great Sacrifice, because the victim was His only-begotten Son.

This then was "the great mystery of godliness the angels desired to look into," and which stood revealed to men and angels when they were permitted to comfort the Son of Man upon the cross with the assurance that He had "triumphed gloriously."

God's first contract with man was—Believe in my word, and your reward shall be immortal life in a paradise on earth.

God's second agreement runs—Do your uttermost to fulfil all my laws, without which there can be no peace on earth; but as I foresee that no one of you will ever obey them perfectly, so as to earn immortality, I will account unto you for righteousness your belief in my "Living Word," "the Word made flesh," and give you a crown of life in the paradise which is above.

And then God asks—"Why will you die?" "What more could I have done for you?" Paul's commentary is, "It is thus by God's grace we are saved, and that not of ourselves, it is the gift of God." The magnitude of the reward is so utterly out of proportion to the littleness of the work, that it makes it as difficult to realize the intensity of God's love as to reach the immensity of His power. The only possible explanation is, that in God's eyes the only greatness is goodness, and that He will have perfection from us in our faith, to condone the imperfection in our works.

The Christian axiom, "Believe, and thou shalt be saved," is too grand a truth to need addition, too simple a fact to bear subtraction. It stands in perfect harmony with the assurance that, "the way of salvation is so plain, that a man, though a fool, need not err therein," and with Christ's summary of religion—"Love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and thy neighbour as thyself," for "Love is the fulfilling of the law."

If the atonement did not suffice to remove the veil between God and His human family, then the Bible is not the Word of God. If that veil was taken away by Christ's victory, then any pretence of human intercessors to come between us and our Father is a presumptuous sin; and any ritual based on such an assumption is a satanic folly.

It is said of Christ, that without a parable spake He not unto them.

A being of flesh and spirit can only comprehend facts purely spiritual by analogies from things palpable to his senses.

The Bible is thus full of parables in action or in words; it begins and ends with a parable.

The Tree of Life illustrated the necessity for the minutest observance of God's all-perfect laws,—a necessity, of which modern science is daily furnishing fresh proofs.

The consequences of the fall of the first Adam, and the means and method of redemption, are illustrated in the altar and the sacrifice, the temple, its priests and rites.

The temple, in type and symbol, outlines the whole of religion in principle and ritual, in both dispensations; in the one partially veiled, in the other fully revealed. They "saw through a glass darkly, we now, face to face."

The glass darkened by God's mercy, cleared by Christ's love, was soon smutted over by Satan's malice. It is well known now, whose were the fingers that spread the soot, whose the pens that fixed the biggest flakes.

What the temple signified, that every Christian must be; what the temple indicated, that every Church must become; what the temple on earth was in shadow, that the temple in heaven is in substance.

All believers, in the first phase of faith, saw through the temple the Man that was to come; all Christians look back to the temple as to a brilliant mirror, reflecting themselves and their work, imaging their Redeemer, disclosing their Creator.

The temple thus stands as the grandest and greatest of Christian antiquities; and its evidence on the ritual question is irresistible and irreversible.

The Scriptures leave us in no doubt as to the motives which led to the adoption of this parable in stone,—this telling out of the whole wondrous story of man's fall and re-edification in the language of architecture, used throughout with such unerring technical accuracy, that every word is individualized as a distinct witness to the truth.

We have the fact clearly and decisively stated, that God Himself designed the temple with all its minutest details, organized its rites, appointed the significant dresses of its priests with the express object of demonstrating His plan of salvation and of making that equally clear to the humblest as to the highest intellect. He thus made the temple the illustrated horn-book and grammar of Christianity, which the child can read and the man must.

The Bible, therefore, abounds with temple imagery and language, and its writers credit their readers with a knowledge of this fact, and pass from builders' idioms to direct speech without pause or comment.

"The builder and maker of all things is God." He upholdeth all things that He has made;—therefore, God is "Our Rock."

Man was made in the image of his Maker;—therefore he is a "*stone*" cut off from that "rock."

God took the dust of the earth, built up with it man's body and breathed into it the breath of life;—therefore man was a living temple of his Creator.

Under the first assault from Satan the first Adam fell;—therefore he was a temple in ruins.

To re-edify the ruined house—man—the wise Master Builder, who carries out all the designs of the Great Architect of the universe, appears on earth as the son of a humble builder, to do the work of His Heavenly Father, as it is done in heaven; thus builds Himself up into a perfect temple steadfast to the end, thus becomes the chief corner-stone in the restored temple of humanity, bases its walls of salvation on His divine nature, and thus becomes the "rock of our salvation."

"As he that hath builded the house hath more honour than the house," the Son of God was thus greater than all the sons of men; and therefore, "God laid on Him the iniquities of us all."

Until the work was done, its full effects could not be permitted; but God, in honour of His great Son's intended sacrifice, allowed it a retrospective efficacy, and accepted the blood of bulls and of goats as a type of the only atoning blood of "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world."

Driven from His home in the hearts of His erring children, the Almighty Father meanwhile dwelt in a temple of dead stones, dwelt in the thick darkness of His displeasure, though on the 'mercy seat' over the broken laws, till Christ became the real vail between man's impurities and the consuming fire of God's purity.

Thus excluded as a family from direct intercourse with the Father, He, in honour of Christ's intention to become our High Priest and Mediator, permitted intermediately a chosen caste to approach the outer chamber of His presence; and one only of that select few, and that once only in the year, to enter the symbolical holy of holies.

A sacerdotal caste and ritual were thus, of divine origin, part of man's punishment and the proof of his degradation.

When the "It is finished" left the lips of Christ upon the cross, the veil of the temple was rent in twain; the way into the actual presence of God—the real Holy of Holies—was now open to all—His fiat was issued that not one stone should remain upon another of the typical house, because, from henceforth "God dwelleth not in temples made with hands."

With the abolition of caste, there was an end to the ritual of caste. The Apostles being all, save one, marked with the Master Builder's sign of approval,—a mark which no other stones have since received,—were laid as foundation stones, with Christ, in his human nature the chief corner-stone, all on His Divine nature, the sustaining rock of the walls of salvation.

It is not the succession that makes the stones, but they the succession.

It is not the succession of stones, but their continued uprightness, that keeps walls over their base.

A succession of "foundation stones" is too great an absurdity to need gravely combating.

A foundation stone is one thing, a *foundation* is quite another thing. "Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid;" and when Paul said that, the Apostles were all living; what he meant was, that Christ, the "Rock of Ages," was the only thing for any one to build on.

Paul, the extreme ritualist, and, while such, "the bitter persecutor of the brethren," whose training in sacerdotalism was so strict, whose experience of its various phases was so great, is surely an unimpeachable witness to its abolition.

He knew Rome, with its 400 gorgeous sanctuaries dedicated to as many gods; he had seen the temples of Greece in their full glory, marvelled at their magnificence and grandeur, studied the exquisite taste and beauty of their proportions, witnessed the matchless skill of their execution.

He knew that nothing on earth, of mere human invention, could produce a more perfect combination to enchant the ear, entrance the eye, and enchain the intellect, than the ritual connected with the glorious temple that crowned the Acropolis of Athens.

There was but one other structure on earth—one other ritual—that embodied still more solemn grandeur, included yet more evidence of high thought, and witnessed to far more devoted munificence.

Beautiful for situation, "the joy of the whole earth," the temple on Mount Moriah's brow,—in its site, its construction, its costly materials, its elaborate rites, and the number of its priests, clad in significant and splendid garments; its services, its hymns of prayer and praise and thanksgiving, composed in the finest poetry ever heard, accompanied by music of equal beauty, with the sweet singers of Israel for performers and the nation for congregation,—embodied every ideal of material grandeur, and presented a scene of magnificence and beauty such as the earth can never hope to look upon again.

All the fascinations of the Pagan ritual, all the sublime magnificence of the Jewish, did not weigh with Paul one feather, when he realized the full meaning of Christianity, and saw that its glorious light had dissipated the obnoxious gloom. He is not content to urge men to forsake the one for the other, but requires them to cast off all the rites and trappings of sacerdotalism as "filthy rags," to be looked on with disgust and loathing, now that the Sun of Righteousness they had veiled, stood fully revealed in all the majesty of His glory.

"Henceforth," he exclaims, "I am resolved to know nothing among you save Christ and Him crucified;" and then, with inspired foreboding of the treacherous quarter from which the great corruption would come that robs God of the fulness of His mercy, Christ of His atoning greatness, and Christians of all their spiritual kingly honours and priestly privileges, he twice sorrowfully repeats the warning—"I fear lest by any means ye should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ."

"I know," says Paul, "that after my departure grievous wolves shall enter in;" and his advice to the sheep is—"Let no man have dominion over your faith;" "Work out your own salvation;" "Let all things be done to the use of edifying," that is, building yourselves up into temples; "Ye then, as wise master builders," take care that you build with the gold and silver to be found only in God's word, and avoid the hay and straw rubbish of tradition; "Exhort one another;" "Confess your faults one to another," not to a priest; "Bear each other's burdens, and so fulfil the law of Christ."

"Stand fast, therefore, in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made you free, and be not entangled again in the yoke of bondage."

If that does not mean, no more human priests, no more sacerdotal rituals, who will tell us what it does mean?

We read that "the common people heard Christ gladly;" they could understand His teaching. We are told that it was the typical stewards, appointed to prepare the "House" for the reception of the Son, who slew Him when He came to take possession of His inheritance. It was the fear of losing their caste privileges which instigated the cry from the lips of the Jewish priests—"Crucify Him! crucify Him!" It was the lust for caste distinction which induced the mediæval would-be priests to justify their claim by pretending to repeat a Sacrifice that was once only and for ever, and thus to put the great Son of God to an open shame, by reducing Him to the level of a sacrificial beast.

It was the treacherous unbelief concealed in Cain's offering of beautiful fruits, which caused its rejection.

As the partaking of forbidden fruit is the definition of sin, so the offering of forbidden fruit is the ritual of sin.

From the beginning, all true service to God has consisted in simply doing what He has commanded, as evidence of belief in His word. If ancient precedent in ritualistic corruptions is to prevail, there is no need to wait for examples till "the fathers" began to slip; Cain begins the list, and the name of the Cainite school is—Legion.

When Moses came down from the Mount, he found that, during his absence, Aaron his brother, the Lord's high priest, out of the women's trinkets, had made the cast and organized the ritual of the golden calf, before which the chosen people were bending the knee in frenzied worship, to the full swing of their servile propensity to sensual and sensuous services

To recall them from their frequent backslidings of this nature, God said unto Ezekiel, "Show them the House;" and the prophet forthwith proceeds to enumerate its leading features, well knowing that each detail bore its own lesson; that each lesson led up to the one conclusion—"This is the law of the House," "Holiness to the Lord." The rule to work that out, Isaiah gives in the idiomatic speech of a builder: "Lay judgment to the line, righteousness to the plummet;" "for," says Solomon, "by wisdom is a house builded, and by understanding it is established."

To show "the House" to the people in the flood of light due to its fulfilment in Christ, is one of the main objects of the New Testament.

"Know ye not," say the Apostles, "that the kingdom of God is within you," and that "ye are temples of the Living God?"

Of such a kingdom, none but the man himself can be the king; of such a temple, none but the man himself can be the priest.

The Apostles therefore declare, as they were bound to do, that all are partakers with them in the heavenly calling, that all "are made a royal priesthood."

"Ye also," says Peter, "as lively stones, are built up a spiritual priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God through Jesus Christ."

It follows as the inevitable deduction from the fact that a Christian is a "living temple," that the altar and the sacrifice, the vail and the door, the sanctuary and the holy of holies, are within him.

It is his own repentance and faith that are the only possible keys to unlock the door; the ascent of his grateful thanks and praise, the only incense God will inhale; the offering of a broken and contrite heart, the only sacrifice God will accept, when offered through Christ, the only Mediator and Intercessor, who sprinkles it with His atoning blood, throws the robe of His righteousness over the offender, puts the vail of His Divinity between the man's impurities and the consuming fire of God's purity, and thus admits His adopted brother into direct intercourse with the All-merciful Father, present in each Christian heart in the wondrous light of His marvellous love.

It is inconceivable that any man in his senses can conceive that the back-stair influence of any human intercessor is necessary between an adopted son and such a Father as this.

It follows as the irresistible deduction from the fact that a Christian *is* a living temple, that he is a complete Church in himself, with every possible and needful ritual requisite within him; and that at the gathering together of the two or three such temples which constitute "the Church that is in every house," the only lawful or consistent service acceptable to God, is the giving outward expression to the only acceptable inward service; and that thus the ritual suitable for the private family, or Church, needs but expansion to fit the more public family, or Church.

It is ordained that "a bishop must be the husband of one wife;" and some one says, that if the Pope had married, he would never have dreamed of thinking himself infallible; "for if he knows not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the Church of God," the enlarged house?

Surely this proves conclusively that Church officers are to occupy conventionally, the position among the aggregated families, filled in each private family by its natural head; and if they would but be content with being our leaders, instead of striving to be our masters, what a glorious career they might run, what a magnificent harvest they might reap!

The new set of names, with their alliterative changes, given by the Apostles to Church officers, is most significant of their work and decisive of their position in the Christian community. They are thus:—"Bishops," or overseers over their fellow master-builders; "Elders" among their brethren; "Pastors," while leading the flock; "Heralds," to declare the terms of pardon, not judges to *decree* it; "Ambassadors" from the King of kings, to His brother kings; "Stewards," not proprietors, of God's mysteries; "Ministers," to serve the people; but never—never once priests to them.

How clearly and closely this fits with the fact that the true Church, in its catholic sense, is a confederation of kingdoms; a parliament of kings; an association of master-builders; a flock, with the Lamb of God, under the one Great Shepherd; always and everywhere, a meeting of brethren, constituting the one family that can alone reward Christ's sacrifice, and realize His prayer, that "ye may be one, *even* as I and my Father are one"! A unity produced by the union of all hearts and heads under the one Godhead; not that of all necks under one poor human creature's foot.

Here, then, in the divine simplicity of God's Plan of Salvation, we have the most perfect provision for ensuring the widest individual liberty, for securing the closest unity.

Here, then, we have a Church beginning with the first stone cast from heaven into the stagnant waters of life, rippling out in myriads of ever-perfect circles, till the last enfolds the whole surging ocean of humanity; each one having Christ's human nature for its centre, His Divine nature for its circumference—He its model temple, He its Temple of temples.

Here, then, we have a ritual, great in its simplicity, grand in its elasticity, suitable to the one, adaptable to the many, bounded by no time, limited to no place, rendering it but of little moment, so far as the ritual question is concerned, whether the man in solitude, is singing and making melody in his heart to the Lord, or adding his voice in public, to the praises ascending in harmony from the lips of the assembled brethren.

"This is the law of the House"—"Holiness to the Lord;" this is God's precept for ritual—"Worship Him in the beauty of holiness," "Worship Him in spirit and in truth."

While the typical temple was building, no stone was permitted to be brought on the sacred site till it was made truly square by the line, exactly vertical by the plummet; if it bore these tests it was bonded into the walls; if the least imperfection was visible, it was loosed therefrom and destroyed.

In allusion to this rule, so well known to every Jew, and to illustrate the fact that the work of edification into a living temple must be completed on earth—for "neither hammer nor axe must be heard in heaven"—Peter, and through him every other Christian, is warned by Christ, in the parable language He so constantly used—"Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven;" that is, bonded into the walls of salvation, or loosed therefrom, according as each living stone bears, while on earth, the test of the line of judgment and the plummet of righteousness.

Christ explained to His disciples the meaning of the old prophecies, types, and symbols in their application to His nature, work, and office; and then, to test their appreciation of His lessons, asks them all, "And whom sayest thou that I am?" to which the warm-hearted Peter instantly replied, "Thou art the Son of the living God."

St. John tells us that "whosoever will confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him and he in God." In temple language this means that he is a living temple and a stone in the "walls of salvation."

Peter was the first to realize that the divine nature of Christ was "the rock of our salvation," therefore to honour him as the first Christian confessor, Christ goes on to say, speaking at the time in the Syrian language, "blessed art thou, Simon Barjona; flesh and blood hath not revealed this unto thee; henceforth thou shalt be called 'Cephas,' "which is by interpretation a stone;" "and upon this rock I will found my Church"; that is, thou shalt be called Christian for being the first to confess that Jesus is the Son of God.

It is Peter who explains that all Christians are "living stones," or "Peters," and that the faithful men of old "did all eat of the same spiritual meat, and did all drink of the same spiritual drink, for they drank of that rock that followed them, and that rock was Christ."

Peter thus proves that they with whom we are to be one in faith, had a saving faith, without the remotest conception of the doctrine of transubstantiation, with no knowledge even of "objectivity" or "subjectivity," and while in utter ignorance of Peter.

"God only is my rock," said King David: God only is my rock, is the echo from every saint of old.

It is utterly impossible, if you take into account the builders' language used throughout the Bible, to devise words which more completely shut out the suspicion even that Peter could be a rock, other than those used by Christ.

A satanically false reading of those words and a wrong rendering of an old inscription at Rome, recently, says Mr. Froude, proved to have had no reference whatever to Peter, are the two utterly false assumptions on which the whole Papal superstructure has been reared, and its ritual founded.

"Anti-christ" in the scriptural builders' language means a false rock, and thus "the man of sin, sitting in the temple of God," the visible Church on earth, "showeth himself to be God," that is its rock.

Infallibility being the logical deduction from such a premise, and the claim of a worm of the earth to the incommunicable attribute of the Almighty Father having been allowed, the pronouncing of the "It is finished" completed the awful mockery, and the mystery of iniquity stands revealed to men and angels.

It is Jeremiah who wrote of old "the nations have drunken of her wine and the nations are mad."

The parable in action of "the Tree of Life" begins and ends the

Bible, and is associated throughout its pages with the temple parable.

The right to immortality on earth was lost by the disobedience of the first Adam. The gift of eternal life in heaven was won for man by the second Adam never partaking of forbidden fruit.

In His human nature the Branch, in His divine nature the Vine, the Tree of Life, whose leaves are for the healing of the nations, He grafts on that Tree His adopted fellow-human branches, and thus secures to them immortality in the paradise which is above.

As the beginner of the spiritual creation we owe our birth to Him, and are indebted to Him for our daily spiritual sustenance.

He is "our Lord," that is, our "bread giver," both in its material and spiritual sense.

If a living temple, every Christian, in the holy of holies within him, has there a daily portion of this "heavenly manna;" hence the injunction, "feed on Him, therefore, in thy heart by faith;" eat of this spiritual food; drink of this spiritual wine, expressed from the first human fruit of the Tree of Life.

"Do this," says Christ, "in REMEMBRANCE of me." Wheresoever you break bread or drink wine, recollect that your "Staff of Life" was broken on the cross for you, that His blood was shed for you; that He as the Son of man was "wounded for your sins," that He as the Son of God was "bruised for your iniquities."

And then to prevent the possibility of a doubt as to His real meaning, Christ further tells us, "My words are spirit; the letter killeth, the spirit giveth life;" that is, if you materialize a truth so obviously spiritual as this, you die to Christianity.

The term "mass" originated in the custom of dismissing learners, or pagans, admitted on probation, when the Communion was to be administered, and then the officiating minister pronounced the "missa," and told all who were not Christians to leave.—They naturally connected this custom with the rite that obliged them to quit, and thus gave it a slang name.

It is most remarkable that the names used by sacerdotalists are either of civil origin without the remotest connection with the perverted purposes to which the things are now applied, or in the most ludicrous antagonism to the objects for which they are employed. When a vessel was wanted to receive the pretended spare blood, they were foolish enough to retain the word *piscina*, the name for a basin to hold water. When it suddenly struck them in the 10th century to make a greater distinction between the bread before and after consecration, they introduced a special fixture and gave it the name of credence table, a word derived from *credenza*, Italian for a butler's buffet, or plate cupboard.

They are thus also driven to the necessity of talking of chancel (the Latin for a platform) or holy of holies,—bema, (the Greek word for a platform) or sanctuary.

The old Christian terms of freedom jostle also most uncomfortably with the imported priestly innovations of serfdom, and we thus get "my sons," or "my dearly beloved brethren;" "father" instead of "elder brother;" "thrones" for "seats;" "altar" displacing "table;" temple substituted for Basilica, or Conventus as it was afterwards christened, the Latin for a place of assembly.

It required four or five centuries of subtle additions to bridge over the gulf between the Lord's supper and the "sacrifice of the mass," and it is greatly to the credit of Satan's skill that he managed to do it even in that time.

The Church of England brands the doctrine of transubstantiation as "idolatrous and blasphemous," and therefore by implication condemns in equally strong terms its ritualistic development.

She pays her ministers to denounce the doctrine as a deadly sin, and therefore calls on them to proclaim its rites an awful crime.

As Christ's creed places all Christians on the very pinnacle of greatness, it is not enough to prove that a long succession of men did their best to bring them down, and to set up a system and service which made gods of priests and serfs of Christians—the real point at issue is—What right had any one of them, or all of them, to do this?

St. Paul said, for himself and the rest of the apostles, "though we or an angel from heaven preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." It is also written, "Let God be true and every man a liar."

It is not recorded that any angel ever did come down to rob Christians of their primitive rights, by preaching another gospel unto them, but if Church history is to be credited, the men who did this were anything but angels: and as the wholesale importation of Pagan abominations into the Church, all the nefarious falsifications of ancient writings, and of ancient Churches, all the appalling series of forgeries committed, and the innumerable atrocities perpetrated on those who desired to adhere to the "simplicity that is in Christ," lie at the doors of pretenders to priestly power, it is clear by their resorting to such means, that they had no faith in any original title to be "lords over God's heritage," or in any ancient right to set up a ritual which makes the priest everything and the people nothing, and which utterly destroys that family ideal Christ lived to effect and died to obtain.

The Rev. T. W. Perry, SS. Michael and All Angels', Brighton, read the following paper:—

1. In dealing on this occasion with "The Evidence of Christian Antiquity as to Church Ritual," it is neither possible nor desirable to do more than notice some of its main features; details must necessarily be on the whole avoided, and it will be best to refer only to such historical statements as are alike considered authentic by those who draw from them varying or even opposite conclusions.

2. Three points of "Church Ritual" (using the term in its modern conventional sense) which have been the subjects of a revived controversy in the Church of England, especially during the last quarter of a century, are—(1) The form of chancels; (2) The position of altars; (3) The shape, material, and colour of vestments. Other things have, indeed, also received their full share of approbation or reprobation; but these three are those which are commonly regarded as the more prominent, and so, according to their character, sustaining or overthrowing the rest.

3. Some assume merely as the basis of argument, others gladly recognize as a potent fact, that the Church of England professes to defer to Christian, and especially to primitive, antiquity in matters of ritual no less than of doctrine. Hence it has been asserted or denied that the chancels, altars, and vestments in dispute conform to this ancient standard. Let us glance at its general bearing upon them.

4. CHANCELS.—It is certain that before the last of the four general Councils (Chalcedon, A.D. 451), to which the Church of England statutably refers (1 Eliz. c. 1, § 36) as a test of heresy, churches were built in which the *bema* or *sanctuary*[1] corresponded with the *recess* for the Altar which is to be seen in some of our English churches, or with the *sacrarium* which terminates the *chancels* of others: it was elevated above the nave,[2] and had its gates or screen of some kind,[3] which separated it and its ministers from the part in which the people assembled, answering, in fact, to our altar rails. The *choir*, projecting into the nave,[4] was not unlike to the quasi-chancels in some modern churches which have only a small constructional chancel; but though it presented another barrier[5] between Laity and Clergy (especially when, as in some cases, it had a screen[6]), the clerks who occupied it were in effect a link connecting them. Where and when it became recessed, and thus formed a longer or shorter CHANCEL terminating in a sanctuary, it developed rather than contracted the idea of communion by placing some of the people in closer contact with the officiating Clergy, the more part being still as contiguous to the sacrarium and as able to unite in the Liturgy as under the other arrangement. Nor is it difficult to understand that the change was advantageous both as a matter of orderly convenience and on acoustic principles; thus, in these respects, enabling the faithful (*fideles*) as well as, perhaps better than, before to unite, in their character of "a royal priesthood," in the offering of the great Christian Sacrifice.

5. ALTARS.—To a not less early period must be referred a *position* of the ALTAR or HOLY TABLE practically corresponding with the situation relative to the nave now occupied by the Altar in English churches having either long or short chancels: usually it was placed at the chord

---

[1] *Bingham*, viii., 6, § 1, 2. *Neale: Eastern Church*, vol. i., p. 175. *The Great Architect* (Longmans, 1868), p. 85, " . . . ultimately [no date given] the table itself was removed from the body of the church [?], and placed on the *bema*, the Greek word for platform, which was better known by its Latin name *cancelli*. . . ."

[2] *The Great Architect*, p. 107, "The basilica, if too large to be spanned by one roof, was divided into nave and aisles by two rows of columns; and at one end, generally in a semi-circular recess called the 'apse,' was the chancel [?]. The chancel was simply a platform or *bema*, raised a few feet above the level of the room in order to afford a commanding position to the seats of the president of the assembly and his associates. . . ."

"So admirably was the basilica adapted to the Christian ideal of a place of assembly that it was adopted without change of name or parts."

[3] *Bingham*, viii., 6, § 8.

The Great Architect, p. 107, "To prevent accidents, this platform was edged with a low open railing, the Latin term for which was *cancelli*."

[4] *Neale*, i., p. 177.

[5] *Neale*, i., p. 178. Canons both of East and West forbid any but the priest to go into the sanctuary under the earlier arrangement—*e.g.*, 69th of Trullo—though the Emperor of Constantinople was accustomed from earliest times to enter the *bema*, probably from his semi-sacerdotal character.

[6] *Neale*, i., p. 177.

of the apse,[7] and so was separated from the wall; sometimes it was advanced more towards the nave by being placed in the centre under the dome of the church;[8] in both cases it was "set . . . in the middle," as Eusebius states (x., c. 4)—not indeed, as has of late been said, in the middle of the congregation[9]—and so it became the prominent object in the Christian assembly, "presenting," as Eusebius also says, "an admirable sight to the beholders." Its contiguity to the east wall in the Anglican arrangement, though a subject of complaint with some, may fairly be regarded as consistent with, probably an improvement upon, the older position, inasmuch as it brings more into view the officiants and the choir, and so ought to afford satisfaction, because it conforms to that "arrangement" of which a recent writer tells us that none could be "more completely adverse than this to any caste pretension."[10] There are, indeed, some few instances in which the structure of a church might render this position inconvenient; but this is fully provided for by the rubric which orders that "the Table . . . shall stand in the body of the church, or in the chancel, where Morning and Evening Prayer are appointed to be said." The determination of this, however, rests with "the ordinary of the place," and therefore no such inference can correctly be drawn from the direction as is advanced in the same publication, where it is said that "Christianity imperatively requires that the Table should stand in the *midst of the people*, and the Church of England confirms this by her decree, that when the Communion rite is to be administered the 'Table is to be brought out from the chancel into the nave.'"[11]

6. VESTMENTS.—The Chancel and the Altar lead up necessarily to the VESTMENTS worn by those who minister at the Altar. With regard to any claim made to their *Apostolic* origin, it seems enough now to say that an Apostolical *sanction* will not perhaps be denied them in so far as they correspond with the dress which those chosen servants of Christ (not less than their Divine Master) are believed to have used in the celebration of the Lord's Supper. Taking then what may be regarded as the accepted view—that they used in this ministration the ordinary secular garments of that day[12]—we have, at least, the *shape* of the ALB in the usual short *tunic*, or more probably in its longer girt-up form reaching to the feet; and the *shape* of the CHASUBLE in the full flowing vesture which was thrown over the close-fitting coat, at all events as a dress of dignity on solemn or festive occasions. If, as is commonly held (though the point is disputed), the STOLE is a development of the ornamental border of the tunic, a third portion of the ecclesiastical vestments may claim this Apostolic authority.

7. It is however, generally acknowledged that this civil dress of the

---

[7] *Bingham*, viii., 6, § 11. *Neale*, i., p. 180.

[8] *Neale*, i., p. 180.

[9] *The Great Architect*, p. 124, " . . . the indisputable fact that the Communion Table for many centuries stood in the midst of the people [? not in the writer's sense] in the centre of the church."

[10] *The Great Architect*, p. 107.

[11] *The Great Architect*, p. 162.

[12] *Marriott: Vestiarium Christianum*, p. ii., " . . . in the Apostolic age there was no essential difference between the dress worn by Christians in ordinary life and that worn by bishops, priests, or other clerics when engaged in offices of holy ministration."

first century became more distinctly ecclesiastical in the course of the next three hundred years:[13] this is shown by such incidental notices as the accusation against St. Athanasius, that he *compelled* "the linen vestments of the Church" to be provided; the mention in the Fourth Council of Carthage of the albe for the deacon; the "bright and shining garments" of deacons named by Gregory Nazianzen; the orarion (stole) ordered by the Canons of Laodicea to be worn on the shoulders by bishops, priests, and deacons. It may be that this mention of *material* and *colour* indicate a purpose even then of making some difference not merely between the ordinary garments of the Laity and their counterpart as used officially by the Clergy, but also between the *usual* and the *ministerial* dress of the Clergy themselves.

That it was deemed right to make such a distinction seems clear from what St. Jerome remarks in his comments on the Levitical vestments, for he says—"By all this we learn that we, too, ought not to enter into the Holy of Holies in our every-day garments, just such as we please, when they have become defiled from the use of ordinary life, but with a clean conscience, and in clean garments, hold in our hands the Sacraments of the Lord" (*Marriott*, p. 30).

Probably in *material* and *colour* was found the only convenient way of marking a contrast, if, as has been said, "In the primitive period of about 400 years the dress of Christian ministry was in form, in shape, in distinctive name, identical with the dress worn by persons of condition on occasions of joyous festival or solemn ceremonial" (*Marriott*, iii.). For it may well have been that some other diversity was needful or useful to distinguish the *ecclesiastical* from the *civil* wearer, although it is further stated that "this was a dress which in such wise differed from the habit of every-day life and of ordinary wear, that it was marked out plainly in the eyes of all as a garb proper to occasions of religious worship, and of solemn assembly in the presence of God" (*Ib.*).

8. The choice (assuming it to have been such) of *linen* for *material* and of *white* for *colour* need not, however, imply a rejection, even at that period, of other material and other colour. This may, perhaps, be inferred (as to *material*) from the symbolical comparison made by St. Isidore of Pelusium (*cir.* 400) between "the linen vestment [whatever it was] with which the Deacons minister in the Holy Place" as "a memorial of the humility of our Lord in washing and wiping dry the feet of the disciples," and "that which the Bishop weareth on his shoulders, made not of linen but of wool," and "which signifieth the fleece of the sheep, for which, when it had wandered away, the Lord sought, and took it up on His own shoulders." For, assuming that in both cases it was only an *ornament* which is referred to, there seems nothing inconsistent in extending the choice of material to a *garment* also.

9. Then as to *colour*. If, as it would appear, the Clergy in their ordinary dress "were more confined" than the Laity "to wear that which was modest and grave, and becoming their profession," and if, as St. Jerome's direction to Nepotian may imply, "white" then (in the

[13] *Bingham*, xiii., 8 § 2.

The Great Architect, p. 110, "The garments of the day, various in form and name, were worn by ministers and people in church and out of church, and only became distinctive to the former by the latter adopting newer fashions."

West) indicated "gaiety," and "black" pointed to "slovenliness" (*Bingham*, vi., 4, § 18), some sober colour was likely to be worn by the Clergy as their ordinary dress. Yet, as associations often regulate the supposed fitness of things, the use of *white* or *black* in *ecclesiastical* ministrations need not have conveyed the idea which was liable to be attached to them when otherwise employed. Obviously as regards *white*, St. Jerome himself considered that it did not; for, censuring those who, as he says, in a "spirit of exaggeration, and without thought or regard for any moderate course," said "that all splendour of dress or ornament is offensive unto God," he adds,—"I would fain know what offence there would be against God in my wearing a somewhat handsome tunic, or if, in the administration of the holy things, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, and the Officers of the Church come forward dressed in white garments." The recent statement of a careful investigator, that "in all the examples of *white* dress worn by apostles or by ecclesiastics" which he had observed in the first six centuries, the "ornamental stripes" were "black" (*Marriott*, p. xxxviii.), is sufficient to show (even allowing for the qualification of which it seems to admit[14]) that what has been said about *white* may also be applied to *black* in circumstances other than those wherein St. Jerome accounted it a badge to be avoided.

10. When and where, however, as in our own age and in this and other countries, *white* and *black* are deemed the fitting colours for an ecclesiastic's usual dress, it seems a reasonable conclusion that other colours ought not to be *excluded*, if they be not *preferred*, in public ministrations, especially at the Altar. That they were not deemed inadmissible in the fourth century is shown by the well-known instance of the "sacred robe made of threads of gold" sent by the Emperor Constantine to Macarius, Bishop of Jerusalem. It has been objected, indeed, that as this robe was to be put on by Macarius when performing the Office of Holy Baptism, "therefore it proves nothing about Eucharistic vestments at all" (*Marriott*, xxxi.); but it would seem sufficient to reply, that, if worn for a sacrament in which *white* was regarded as the appropriate colour, it is difficult to believe that its splendour or colour would have excluded it from the Altar Service. As to an apparent suggestion that its subsequent sale by St. Cyril, and that its passing "into the hands of a stage dancer" (*Ib.*), indicated its

---

[14] *Marriott*, p. lix., "From a passage of St. Isidore it has been inferred by some that all dalmatics had *clavi* or ornamental stripes of *purple*. But this is evidently a mistake. Of the very few ecclesiastical dalmatics earlier than the year 600 whose date and whose colour I have been able to determine, none have any other than black stripes. And even if exceptions should be found, no more could be proved than that the *clavi* of such dalmatics *might* be purple."

He considers that Dr. Hefele is wrong in saying that the *clavi* on the dalmatics in the Ravenna Mosaic are *purple*. Mr. Marriott says they are *black*.

He mentions that in a coloured drawing in the Windsor collection of a mosaic (*cir.* 640), the Apostles have "red *clavi* upon their tunics."

At p. lxxv. he also states that in mosaics "now in St. Sophia at Constantinople," the "white vestments" are depicted, "in five out of the six figures," with "*lora* or stripes" of "two lines of purple and red; in one (that of Gregory of Armenia) of red only. The crosses in the Omopharion correspond in colour, in every case, to those of the *lora*."

This being so, it requires a reason, which has not been shown, for drawing a hard line at A.D. 600.

unsuitableness for the Church of Jerusalem, it is open to the remark—that even legitimate sales of Church ornaments in England, in the fifteenth century, did not always secure them from falling into improper hands.

11. The subsequent progress of vestments (if, indeed, it was progress in the *East* as well as in the West) prior to the great division of Christendom may be sufficiently summed up now in the candid statement of one who seems hardly to view it with satisfaction. Speaking of "early in the ninth century," Mr. Marriott remarks that "Churchmen who had travelled widely, as then some did, in East as well as West, could hardly fail to notice the remarkable fact, that at Constantinople as at Rome, at Canterbury as at Arles, Vienna, or Lyons, one general type of ministering dress was maintained, varying only in some minor details; and that this dress everywhere presented a most marked contrast to what was *in their time* the prevailing dress of the Laity." (*Marriott*, p. lxxviii.) And when the same writer states that "by the ninth century we find such coloured stoles" (as had been used in Spain by "some of the younger Clergy" as "early as the beginning of the seventh century"), "bedecked with gold, represented both in Italy and in Gaul" (*Ibid.*, p. 216), enough is implied as to the development of colour by that time, even if it were absolutely certain that no manifestation of it had appeared earlier.

"The beauty of the Church's ornaments increased with the increase of years," says a ninth-century writer (Walafrid Strabo); and remarking that the "number" of the vestments of the West did then "correspond with the vestments of the old law," he describes them as "dalmatic, alb, maniple, stole, girdle, sandals, chasuble, and pallium;" of the last he says that it was "worn only by chief Pastors, as the "frontlet" was "only by High Priests." With these, except the sandals, substantially corresponded the unchanged and still unchanging ecclesiastical garments of the East.

12. That in shape, material, and colour the ancient vestments of the Church of England agreed mainly with those used in Eastern and in the rest of Western Christendom there was abundant evidence in the middle of the sixteenth century, and there is sufficient proof now. Opinions somewhat differ as to the comparative influence of Eastern or Western customs in determining the pre-Reformation usage. Whether the post-Reformation apparent preference for the cope instead of the chasuble implies Greek longings rather than Latin antipathies may admit of doubt; but certain it is that in the Prayer Book of 1549 there was a deliberate adhesion to a standard which so far proclaimed communion in Ritual with the separated portions of the once undivided Church.

13. It would be a singular supposition that the Church Congress of 1870, in deciding to discuss "The Evidence of Christian Antiquity as to Church Ritual," has a merely curious desire to obtain information as to the origin of certain accessories of Divine Service in the ages that are past and gone. If so, it tells of a strange incongruity with the other subjects brought before your notice. It must, therefore, be that the recognition of some growing desire to improve the Services of the sanctuary, especially in connection with the Eucharistic Office, has invested this subject with a *practical* character not out of keeping with

those other matters affecting the welfare of the Church of England to which the Managers of the Congress have called our attention.

14. No doubt this desire has to confront the fear that a return to earlier Ritual accessories involves risk of doctrinal error; and even alarm is likely to be raised when statements are made such as the following by a learned writer on Ritual, who says, "that this development of the sacerdotal dress was exactly coincident in time with the development of innovations in Eucharistic doctrine, which were distinctly mentioned for the first time early in the ninth century, and which culminated in the decree of the Eleventh Lateran Council concerning Transubstantiation, *anno* 1215."[15] Yet it is not easy to understand how "the doctrine of Paschasius," which, as the same writer tells us, "was thought so strange" when it was enounced, can be identified with a developed dress which everywhere alike was recognised. While, however, it is a duty of Christian charity to respect such fears, it is well to recollect that the fears themselves often obscure historical facts. I will give an instance. Some twenty years ago it was gravely told me, by a person of education and position (in illustration of his theory that Churches had altered their structural arrangements, owing to the development of certain doctrines), that the choir floor of a certain cathedral had been raised with the growth of false Eucharistic doctrine; and that the floor of the Lady Chapel had been similarly raised still more, concurrently with the adoption of novel teaching as to the Blessed Virgin. Whatever difficulty there might have been in disproving the former statement, it was somewhat unfortunate for the latter that a late post-Reformation ducal vault had necessitated the higher platform.

15. The movement to restore in the Church of England ancient ecclesiastical ornaments is on its trial. It remains to be seen whether what was once universal can be adapted to this age; the attempt may fail from lack of considerateness on the part of its promoters, or from want of guidance on the part of authority. It may even be that, in resorting to an ancient type, a prejudice for one or another phase of it provokes some dislike, and so hinders its acceptance. The time will perhaps come (it has not yet arrived) when Authority will have to consider what and how much of ancient Ritual can be advantageously revived generally. It probably would be wise then, and indeed now, to remember the answer of Pope Gregory to Saint Augustine, when the latter asked him what form of Divine Service he should settle in Britain—the old Gallican (then used in Queen Bertha's Church of St. Martin, Canterbury) or the Roman?—"Whatever you find either in the Roman, or Gallican, or any other Church which may be more pleasing to Almighty God, I think it best that you should carefully select it, and settle it in the use of the English Church, newly converted to the faith; for we are not to love things for the sake of the place, but places for the sake of the good things we find in them. Therefore you may collect out of every Church whatever things are pious, religious, and right, and putting them together, instil them into the minds of the English, and accustom them to the observation of them." (*Bede*, i. 27.)

---

[15] *Marriott*, p. lxxxi.

Nor should the same Pontiff's advice to a Spanish Bishop (Leander) be forgotten—"There is no harm done to the Church Catholic by different customs, so long as the unity of the faith is preserved." (*Bingham*, xvi., 15.)

ADDRESS.

Rev. John Harrison, D.D.

My Lord Bishop,—The earliest and almost the only distinct cases of Ritual, are in immediate connection with the celebration of the Lord's Supper. In fact, during the first two hundred years of the Christian Church, there are scarcely any other reliable instances of Ritual worth naming. In the fifth century the Ritual had become much developed, and especially so about the beginning of the ninth century. At this time commentaries were written upon it by Alcuin, Rabanus Maurus, and Amalarius, a full examination of which cannot fail to show that, so far as Ritual is expressive of doctrine in regard to the Eucharist, these leading divines of that day were in substantial agreement with the earlier doctors of the Catholic Church. But about this time Paschasius published his treatise "On the Lord's Body and Blood," in which he maintained that after the consecration of the elements, "nothing must be believed but the flesh and blood of Christ" (Cap. i., Bibl. Mag. Vet. Patr., tom. ix., pt. i., p. 121).

This important treatise led to an essential change in the doctrine of Church Ritual; Roman Bishops and Roman Councils soon took sides with Paschasius. Ritual was framed more in accordance with the new doctrine, and the exposition of Church Ritual in the thirteeth century became essentially different from that of the ninth century. I will give a single illustration. Rabanus Maurus, early in the ninth century, in his exposition of Ritual in relation to the body and blood of the Lord, said, "Therefore as the Sacrament (meaning of course the outward sign only) is changed into us, when we eat and drink it, so also we are changed into the body of Christ, whilst we live obediently and piously. But yet the dignity and power of the Sacrament itself (meaning of the outward sign only) are so great, that whoever receives it unworthily, rather procures condemnation than salvation" (On the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of the Lord, De Institutione Clericorum, lib. i., c. 31; Opera, tom. vi., p. 11).

But William Durandus, in the thirteenth century, in his exposition of Ritual in relation to Christ's body and blood, said, "But it should be observed, that in the Body of Christ there are considered to be eleven miracles, of which no plain reason can be given . . . The first miracle is, that the bread and wine are transubstantiated into the body and blood" (Rat. Div. Offi., lib. iv., c. 41, § 16).

Ritual then, in this connection, is not a matter of mere indifference, but is of paramount importance, and is really felt to be so by many "religious and simple minds." "But for such," says Cyprian, "there is a short way, both to put away error and to find and elicit truth. For if we return to the head and source of Divine tradition human error ceases" (Epist. lxxiv., Opera, tom. ii., p. 215).

In reverting, then, to the head and source, and first outflowing of Ritual in regard to the Lord's Supper, I purpose to occupy the time allotted to me in considering the more important acts and actors in the celebration of that Holy Rite. "Do this in remembrance of Me" (Luke xxii. 19). What is to be done, and who are to do it? What does Scripture teach, and what were the practices and theories of early post-apostolic times? The words "Do *this*" are in contrast to doing some other thing; and on this Chrysostom well remarks, "Seest thou how He removes and draws them off from Jewish customs? For like as ye *did that*, He saith, in remembrance of the miracles in Egypt, so *do this* likewise in remembrance of Me" (In Matt. Hom. 82, Opera, tom. vii., p. 699).

Now, what had to be done, and who had to do it, in the Jewish Passover? One undoubted act, St. Luke informs us, was the giving of thanks, or the Eucharist, in connection with the cup (Luke xxii. 17), and that is quite sufficient for the present purpose. This was not necessarily done by High-priest, Priest, or Levite, but by one of the congregation as the representative of his brethren. The disciples in the name of their Lord said, "I will *do* the Passover at thy house *with* my disciples" (Matt. xxvi. 18). And we know in fact, that the disciples *did* the Passover *with* their Divine Master. This little word "*do*" corresponding to a Hebrew and Greek word, and of which it is the equivalent, is a most important and comprehensive term. One out of its multifarious applications is to the Passover. It is employed in the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures thirty-nine times in the sense of *to do* the Passover. As an instance, Moses said, "Let the children of Israel *do* the Passover" (Num. ix. 2). The first Passover took place before the establishment of the Jewish priesthood, and the feast in commemoration of the original Passover was done by Laymen. It has been seen that one important act of the Jewish Passover was to consecrate the cup by giving of thanks, and that this was done by Laymen and not necessarily by a Priest. It is natural to infer, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, that no exclusive priestly character was required to consecrate the cup in the Christian Passover. This does not depend on inference only, but on positive proof, both from holy Scripture and the unanimous consent of early antiquity. In regard to Scripture, the only other undoubted instance of consecration is that given by the Apostle Paul, and it is as follows: "The cup of blessing which *we* bless . . . the bread which *we* break . . . For *we* being many are one bread and one body: for *we* are all partakers of that one bread" (1 Cor. x. 16). Theophylact in the eleventh century remarks on the first part of this text, almost in the very words of Chrysostom, "That is, the cup of Thanksgiving, for, holding it in our hands, we bless Him, and give thanks to Him, who shed His blood for us" (Comment. in 1 Epist. ad Cor. x. 16). Beyond all question the act of consecration is here ascribed by the Apostle to the whole congregation of communicants.

Passing from Scripture to early tradition, the first and most important witness is Justin, who flourished about the middle of the second century, and died a martyr. He was neither Bishop nor Priest, but a Layman. Speaking of the sacramental elements, he says, "The bread which our Christ gave us *to do* in remembrance of His being made flesh in behalf of those who believe in Him, for whom also He suffered, and the cup which He gave us *to do* in remembrance of His own blood, with giving of thanks" (Dialog. cum Try., Opera, p. 231). It is true that he speaks of the Lord's Supper as a sacrifice, and all the communicants as priests and sacrificers; but then it is only in a spiritual sense, as in Scripture all believers are spoken of as "a holy priesthood offering spiritual sacrifices" (1 Peter ii. 5). Thus, in reasoning with a Jew, he says, "We, who through the name of Jesus believe as one man on God, . . . are the true high-priestly race of God, as He Himself testifies, saying, 'that in every place among the Gentiles they offer sacrifices pure and well pleasing to Him.' But God accepts not sacrifices from any except through His priests. God has therefore beforehand declared that all who through this name *do* those sacrifices which Jesus, who is the Christ, commanded *to be done*, that is to say, in the Thanksgiving of the bread and of the cup, which *are done* in every part of the world by us Christians, are well-pleasing to Him. . . . Yet even now you assert that God is pleased with the prayers of the individuals of that nation then dispersed, and calls their prayers sacrifices. That prayers indeed and thanksgivings offered up by the worthy, are the only sacrifices which are perfect and acceptable to God, is what I myself also affirm, for these alone the Christians also have been taught *to do*, and that in the remembrance *done* by their food, both solid and liquid, in which there is a commemoration also of the passion endured for their sakes by the Son of God" (Ibid., pp. 269, 270). It is a matter of certainty that that kind of sacrifices, and that only, is recognised by the Fathers generally.

Subsequently, the Ritual employed in the celebration of the Lord's Supper was so framed as to admit in a more formal manner the congregational act of thanksgiving. Thus Augustine, in explaining the order of the Sacrament to the newly baptized, shows that the "sursum corda" and the act of thanksgiving (which with him was the consecration act) were done by the whole congregation (De Diversis Sermo, lxxxiii. tom. x., pp. 556, 557).

Chrysostom very distinctly shows the same thing. Thus, when addressing the communicants, he said, "There were occasions in which there was no difference at all between the Priest and those under him: for instance, when we are to partake of the awful mysteries. . . . For in the most awful mysteries themselves the Priest prays for the people, and the people pray for the Priest; for the words 'with thy spirit,' are nothing else than this. The offering of thanksgiving again is common, for neither doth he give thanks alone, but also all the people. For having first taken their voices, next, when they assent that it is 'meet and right so to do,' then he begins the thanksgiving." He concludes by remarking, "Now I have said this, in order that each one of the Laity also may keep their attention awake, that we may understand that we are all one body, having such differences amongst ourselves as members with members" (In Epist. ad 2 Cor., Hom. xviii., tom. ix., p. 873). Elsewhere, speaking of the Priest in relation to the Sacraments, he says, "The Priest only performs a symbol," and goes on to remark, "I am about to say what may appear strange, but be not astonished nor startled at it. The offering is the same, whether a common man or Paul or Peter offer it" (In Epist. ad 2 Cor., Hom. ii., tom. x., p. 1638).

Tertullian and Jerome, two of the most important Latin Fathers of the ages in which they lived, laid down this broad principle in regard to the Sacraments, that what a man hath received, that he can give (Ter. De Bap., c. xvii., Opera, p. 225; Jer. Adver. Lucif., tom. ii., p. 139).

As late as the twelfth century, in a homily ascribed to Bernard and published in his works, we have this statement —"As if only the Priest consecrated or sacrificed the Body of Christ. It is not he alone who sacrifices, it is not he alone who consecrates, but the whole congregation of the faithful which is present consecrate with him, sacrifice with him" (Sermo in die Puri., tom. ii., f. 257).

Beyond all question, according to all antiquity, the congregational act of thanksgiving, as founded on the word and authority of Christ, was that which effected the consecration of the sacramental or mystical elements; and hence from early antiquity down to the present time that holy rite has been most commonly called the Eucharist, that is, the Thanksgiving.

The Jewish Ritual and the Christian Ritual required a president in doing the Passover. In the former it was generally the elder of the family; in the latter it was always one of the elders or presbyters of the congregation, of whom there was always more than one, and generally it was the chief presbyter,—who, before the end of the second century, bore the exclusive title of Bishop.

Now it is important to notice what position the president held according to the Jewish Ritual, as it is probable that the president in the Christian Ritual would hold a similar position. To be informed on this point, it is desirable to compare the account which each Ritual gives of the words of institution. Moses said, "It (the lamb, sacrifice, or feast) is the Lord's Passover" (Exodus xii. 11, 27). Christ said, "This is my body." Of course there is an infinite difference between Moses and Christ, and consequently the form of institution differs. Now had Moses made the institution in the name of Jehovah as the Lord Jesus did in His own name, the institution must have been worded thus: "This is my Passover." Or had the Lord Jesus made His institution by His servant Peter, as Jehovah had done by His servant Moses, then the institution must have been expressed thus,—"This is the Lord's body." To do the Jewish Passover as thus instituted was enjoined on all the Israelites; and to do the Christian Passover as thus instituted was enjoined on all Christians. Now comes the question. In doing the Jewish Passover, were they who presided considered to be in any respect in the place of Jehovah who instituted the Rite in commemoration of the deliverance which He had vouchsafed to the Israelites from the destroying angel; or were they in the place of His servant Moses by whom the Rite was instituted? Neither the one nor the other. It is to be inferred then that those who preside in doing the Christian Passover cannot be considered to be in the place of the Lord Jesus—much less can they be supposed to be continuing or repeating the past event of His sacrifice. In doing the Jewish Passover according to the Divine Ritual it was not necessary that any one should personate Jehovah, or even His servant Moses. All that was necessary was to have the sanction of God, and that was recognised in repeating the words of institution. The like remark equally applies to the doing of the Christian Passover. But Christ not only instituted the Christian Passover but also celebrated it with His disciples, and left an example for others to give thanks, and in fact to do as He did, but not to perpetuate or continue His priestly office by representation.

But in an elaborate work of upwards of 1100 pages entitled "Principles of Divine Service," we are told that "The act of consecration is left to the High-priest Himself," and that, "The Consecrator is still no other than Christ, presenting effectually, though by the hands of earthly ministers, the gift" (vol. ii., pt. 2, pp. 363, 365).

This doctrine was probably unknown until the ninth century. At that time Rabanus Maurus, in his commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, not only well expressed his own views, but those of the early fathers generally, and almost in the very words of Chrysostom. On the phrase, "For this He (Jesus Christ the High-priest) did once when he offered up Himself" (Heb. vii. 27), he remarks, "When thou hearest that Christ is a High-priest, do not think that He is always performing the office of High-priest. He certainly has been once constituted in the High-priesthood, henceforth He hath sat down, and lest thou shouldest suppose that He stands and is a minister again, whence the Apostle shows that the duty of the office hath been finished. . . . For as He was made a servant, so also He was made a High-priest and minister. For it is not the part of a minister to sit down but to stand" (Comment. in Epist. ad Heb., lib. xxviii., c. 7; Opera, tom. v., p. 555). Again he states, "This which we do is done in remembrance of that which was done; for, said He, 'Do this in remembrance of me.' We do not offer a different sacrifice as the High-priest did, but always the same, yea, we rather do a remembrance of that sacrifice" (Ibid. c. 10; tom. v., p. 561).

So far were the early fathers from fostering the idea of Christ or His disciples doing any proper sacrificial acts, that they guarded against such a mistake. Theodoret, probably the best of all patristic commentators, has well expressed the sentiments of his brethren in the following words: "If, therefore, both that priesthood, which is of the law, hath received an end, and the priest, who is according to the order of Melchizedec, *has offered* His sacrifice, and has made other sacrifices to be needless, why do the priests of the New Testament perform the mystical (or sacramental) service? It is plain to those who have been instructed in divine things that we do not offer any other sacrifice but perform the commemoration of that one saving sacrifice. For the Lord Himself commanded us, saying 'Do this in remembrance of me'" (Interpret. Epist. ad Heb, cap. viii.; Opera, tom. iii., pp. 594, 595).

Early Ritual then does not make provision for an exclusive sacrificing priest invested with the High-priesthood of Jesus Christ, but it does make provision for all communicants collectively doing a remembrance of the sacrifice of Christ once made. Chrysostom actually applies the words "Do this" to the communicants individually. Thus he says, "Art thou doing a remembrance of Christ?" Again, "Art thou doing a remembrance of thy Master?" . . . "For as Christ, in regard to the bread and the cup, said 'Do this in remembrance of me.' . . . So also Paul saith here, as often as ye eat ye do show His death, and this is that Supper" (In 1 Epist. ad Cor., Hom. 27, tom. ix., p. 565).

In the eleventh century Theophylact reiterated the same sentiments (Comment. in 1 Epist. ad Cor., c. xi. 24).

Now *do this* does not mean *sacrifice this* in any proper sense. If this were the proper meaning of the phrase, then the Laity would be as much sacrificers as their pastors.

Primitive antiquity recognised the priesthood of Laymen. Of all the fathers, golden-mouthed (Chrysostom) John presbyter of Antioch, and finally Archbishop of Constantinople, was the most eloquent; and no father has employed his eloquence so much in extolling the office of a Bishop and a Presbyter as he. But the very highest flight of his eloquence and oratory has been employed in praise of the altar and the sacrifice of the Layman. The following is a specimen—"Wouldest thou see the Layman's altar? Bezaleel built it not, nor any other, but God Himself, not of stones, but of a material brighter than the heaven, of reasonable souls. . . . This altar is composed of the very members of Christ, and the body of the Lord is made thine altar. That then revere; on the flesh of the Lord thou sacrificest the victim. This altar is more awful even than this which we now use, not only than that used of old. Nay, clamour not. For this altar is admirable, because of the sacrifice that is laid upon it, but that, the merciful man's, not only on this account, but also because it is even composed of the very sacrifice which maketh the other to be admired. Again, this is but a stone by nature; but become holy, because it receiveth Christ's body, but that is holy because it is itself Christ's body. So that this beside which thou, the Layman, standest, is more awful than that. Whether, then, does Aaron seem to thee aught in comparison of this, or his crown, or his bells, or the holy of holies?" (In 2 Epist. ad Cor., Hom xx. tom. ix., p. 886.)

DISCUSSION.

The Rev. G. H. Sumner, M.A., Rector of Old Alresford.

My Lord, Ladies, and Gentlemen,—I should not have risen to express my opinion on the subject arranged in the programme, namely, "The evidence of Christian Antiquity as to Church Ritual," except with a special object in view. I would desire for the moment to leave the discussion with reference to Christian Antiquity and Church Ritual to those who are more learned in the subject than I am, and to those to whose tastes, I confess, it is more congenial than to my own. I have risen, my lord, merely with one object in view, and that is in order to enter my protest—humble though it be—against some of the points which were set forth in Mr. Elliott's paper. I was sitting at the other end of the room, and, perhaps, only heard imperfectly some of the statements which were set forth in that paper. I had no intention of sending in my card to your lordship; and it may be that I misinterpreted some of the words which fell from his lips. But if I misinterpreted them, some others may have done the like, and I desire now, in the presence of this Congress, to record my opinion, which I believe is shared in by some others, that there were statements in that paper which we believe cannot be proved by Holy Writ. As I understood Mr. Elliott's paper, it seems to me to cut away from us the possibility of meeting together for the purposes of common prayer and praise in houses specially set apart for the worship of Almighty God. I only say how it appeared to me. I do not say for one moment that Mr. Elliott meant that; but as one sitting in the room, and listening as attentively as I could, that was how it struck me. It also appeared to me (and I think on this point the Congress will, perhaps, concur more with me than in my previous remark), that Mr. Elliott did entirely strive to destroy our belief in any body of men set apart to minister to the spiritual wants of the people. That is my honest opinion, and that is how it struck me. I cannot quote his words, because I have not his paper by me; but it seemed to me that he confused together the anointing of the Holy One, which is for the sanctification of every saved man, and the ordination of a special body of men set apart to minister in God's holy things, in accordance with what we believe we find written in God's Word. Now, my lord, I have no wish to appear before this Congress under false colours, and therefore I confess myself opposed to the exaggerated Ritual which we see unfortunately carried on in some churches in these days. But if I do not wish to appear under false colours, I do not wish myself to appear under Mr. Elliott's colours. While I confess myself opposed to exaggerated Ritual, as I believe many others are also, yet we do not want to be represented in this Congress as Dissenters; we do not wish to be represented as members of the body of Peculiar People. I am not speaking of peculiar people in a Scriptural sense—but of that body of Dissenters who call themselves Peculiar People, and repudiate any ministry whatever. While we object to exaggerated Ritual, in God's name—and I speak it in all reverence—do not let us be supposed to hold by no Ritual at all, for I feel convinced that this would lead to the wildest excesses of unrestrained fanaticism.

Mr. ELLIOTT and Archdeacon FREEMAN now both rose to say that they had been misunderstood.

The Rev. Dr. LITTLEDALE.

MY LORD,—I shall confine myself to one historical question which none of the previous speakers has dwelt upon, and that is, How are we to know what is ancient, and what is gradual development in certain matters of Ritual? and the test is this:—In the fifth century there were great doctrinal struggles in the Church, terminated by the general councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon, against the Nestorians and against the Monophysites. Now, ever since that day there have been about five different bodies of Christians who split off from the general body of the Church Universal at that time, and who have never been reconciled since—who have kept themselves aloof from the Church and aloof from each other during the 1500 years which have since elapsed. These several bodies have their formularies set down in about sixty different liturgies, ranging in date from the fourth century until the thirteenth; and where we find any points of agreement between the sects so divided from one another—agreement with the Eastern Church and with the Western Church—then we know as a certainty that any points on which all these bodies are agreed, must be older than the Council of Ephesus; that is, earlier than the year 431. That is not enough. This agreement between persons divided from one another by geographical distance, by diversity of language, and as belonging to different religious bodies, must have been fixed by some generally recognised authority at a still earlier period. Now that general authority cannot have been during the time of the Councils, because we find the Councils, from that of Nice downwards, laying down particular details of a very small number of things, amongst which these points of agreement are not represented; and therefore we must come to this conclusion—that wherever the Nestorians, the Monophysites, the Orthodox Greek Christians, and the Latin Christians, are all agreed, everything they are agreed upon must have been concurred in at the least as long ago as before the time of the first Council of Nicæa,—the first general Council—which, at any rate, is going back into the third century. Amongst those points are these. (1) A special vestment for the chief Minister at the Holy Eucharist. It so happens that the Egyptian and Persian Christians, the Indian and the Georgian Christians, who parted from one another in the fifth century, are in positive agreement as to the vestments they wear, and allow what closely corresponds with the chasuble of the West. (2) They were all agreed, with the one exception of the Armenians, who were counted as heretics, on the question of the mixture of water with wine in the Eucharistic chalice. (3) They were agreed as to the use of lights at the celebration of the Communion. (4) They agreed as to the elevation of the Sacrament,—and in other things also found a basis of agreement; and therefore we can be certain that on these points no development has taken place. But you have been told that there was a great and sudden development in the ninth century. That was only in the West, when the great

Emperor, Charles, wished to set up and renew that Empire of the West which had fallen four hundred years before. What did he do? He wished to become a Roman Emperor, not a mere Frankish King, and accordingly he borrowed from Constantinople those imperial insignia and ceremonies which had continued in unbroken succession there, and adopted similar fashions for his Clergy and court. And he found usages which had come down from Apostolic times perpetuated in the Church of the East, and imported them into the Church of the West. The new fashions introduced in the ninth century into the West were, in fact, those of the fifth century in the East. Mr. Elliott has said that there was no such thing as a division of any portions of a building set apart for public worship in the Early Church to distinguish one class from another. The Council of Laodicea laid down that no person below the rank of a Deacon—which would exclude even a Sub-Deacon—should enter the bema or sanctuary; that is, come within the altar rail of the ancient Church. Then, again, as regards turning to the East. As a matter of antiquity, it is laid down in the lvii. Chapter of the second Book of the Apostolical Constitutions, a document going back, in part at least, to the third century, that the custom of turning to the East is observed, because we worship Christ, who is the Day-spring from on high. Then in the celebration of the Holy Communion, Mr. Elliott represents the early Christians as reclining or sitting round a table in the Church; but we know it was not so in the time of St. Cyril of Jerusalem, when the Sacrament was received, as he tells us in his Catechetical Lectures, with heads bowed down and hands stretched out. As to the general statement that we have no ceremonial rules positively laid down in the New Testament like those of the Levitical books, I will simply remark that that was because the Jews could not be trusted to deal freely with Divine worship, and it was necessary that they should be bound by a hard and fast line: but the Christian Church, being guided by the Holy Ghost, may be trusted to take care of its own Liturgy. One thing more, as regards the office of the priest. Dr. Harrison had told us that the notion of Consecration of the Eucharist, as confined to the priesthood, acting ministerially for Christ Himself, who, as our great High Priest, is regarded as the real consecrator at every celebration of Holy Communion, was unknown to the ancient Church; and that, in fact, any Layman might act in the matter. But St. John Chrysostom, writing as though with the one object of flatly contradicting Dr. Harrison, has spoken as follows in his sixtieth Homily on Corinthians, addressed to the people of Antioch. "What we here set before you are no works of human power. He who performed them in that Supper, is the same who performs them now. We occupy the position of Ministers; but it is He who hallows and changes them. This table is the same as that one, and possesses no less. It is not true that Christ consecrated that one, and man this one; but Christ Himself consecrates this one also." Prudentius tells us that even the Deacons merely stand to wait on the Priest as he celebrates the sacrifice; and St. Ignatius, almost the coëval of the Apostles, is express in laying down that distinction between Priests and Laymen, which Mr. Elliott has assumed to be of comparatively modern origin.

I will now just say one closing word as to the reason why the early Christians chose the form of the basilica or Roman courts of justice for their places of worship. The divisions of the basilica were almost identical with those of the Jewish synagogue, and the Jewish synagogue was almost identical with the building of the Temple. The synagogues were divided thus:—the lower Church, where men and women assembled, one on the right hand and the other on the left; a raised platform in the centre, where the reader and other officers sat; and a place at the further end where the Ark of the Law was, and where, on special occasions, there was a seven-branched candlestick. All this was intended to suggest to the Jew the main divisions of the Temple of Jerusalem, with its Court of the Gentiles, Court of the Children of Israel, and Court of the Priests, terminating in the Holy of Holies. Now, in the basilica there were the outer vestibule, the great central hall where the people assembled; and at the upper end was the *suggestus*, or raised platform, for the pleaders; and the bema, still higher, for the prætor and his attendants. The basilica was chosen because it thus happened to be not only a place suitable for public worship, but also, by sheer accidental coincidence, happened to be built upon the model of the Jewish Synagogue and the Jewish Temple; and thus too, so far as we can guess from our scanty means of information, in the same general fashion as Christians adopted before the basilicas were made over to them at all.

The Rev. J. C. Ryle, Vicar of Stradbroke.

The subject before the Congress is such a delicate one that I feel great diffidence in standing forward to say anything about it. There is evidently an intrinsic difficulty about it which is recognised in a public document which has lately appeared,—I mean the "Fourth Report of the Royal Commission on Ritualism." I speak in the presence of some members of that Commission, and I desire to speak of their work with the greatest possible respect. But I think we shall all agree that their views do not appear to have been quite harmonious, and that on one point,—namely, in regard to the famous "ornaments" rubric,—they have preserved a most judicious silence.

The discussion of the subject again is extremely difficult in a comprehensive meeting like a Church Congress. It is really impossible to say anything about it without treading rather heavily on the toes of somebody's opinions, and without giving offence, without intention, to some person's mind. However, I believe the platform of a Church Congress is eminently a palace of truth. I believe all schools of opinion are expected honestly and fairly to speak out their minds; and though I and Dr. Littledale don't generally row in the same boat, I hope I may be allowed to say after him what I have got to say. If, as I desire to do, I speak courteously, and kindly, and with due respect for the feelings of others, then, I am sure, a generous English audience will give me a patient hearing. In fact, if any one supposes that my appearance here is like that of the stormy petrel, which goes before the storm, I hope he will find himself very much mistaken.

Now, there is one point, I think, we may a little complain of in the wording of this subject, and that is the vagueness of the expression, "Evidence of Christian Antiquity." I should like to know where "Christian Antiquity" is intended to begin, and where it is supposed to end. I should like to know clearly and distinctly how many centuries this Christian Antiquity is expected to cover. However, I shall confine myself to five remarks, and shall endeavour, as far as I can, to stick closely to my subject. My first remark shall be, that the evidence of the earliest Christian Antiquity as to Church Ritual, is, at the best, extremely scanty. I speak in the presence of many learned men who are conversant with the writings of the Fathers. I am sure no one of them will contradict me when I say that you may almost count on your fingers the writings of the men who lived in the first century; and that amongst those writings there is very little to guide and direct us as to what ought to be the Ritual of the Church. We have no cause to be surprised at this. The object of the early Christians was not so much to do great things with their pens and present their religion in an elaborate Ritual before the world, as to preach the Gospel of Jesus Christ, to live a life conformable to that gospel, to witness before kings, and emperors, and princes, and it may be, to lay down their lives in the maintenance of their religion. This they did, and faithfully; and the work of writing, therefore, in their hands was but small. It has been well said that the days when the Christians met together in the "dens and caves of the earth," and not in splendid buildings, were days when the Church had wooden communion vessels but golden ministers, and when the want of rich communion plate was not felt. Afterwards the biting remark was made that when there was golden communion plate there were too often wooden ministers.

My second remark shall be this. The evidence of antiquity, however far you carry it down, is at best to be received with very great caution. We find from the word of God that the mystery of iniquity was already at work even in the Apostles' times. We find antichrists had arisen even when St. John was writing; and corruption and decay soon crept into the Christian Church, upon ritual as well as upon other points. In Bishop Jewel's famous "Apology," a work which I hope is read and known by many in this room—a work which, for three centuries, has been held in honour in the Church of England—we are told that even Augustine in his day complained that the multitude of ceremonies introduced into the Christian Church had overlaid truth, and led to an immense amount of superstition. This saying of Augustine is also specially referred to in the preface about ceremonies prefixed to our English Liturgy. When, therefore, we refer to antiquity, we should remember that its evidence is at best of doubtful authority, and we should be careful not to assign too much weight to it. My third remark is, that whatever the evidence of antiquity, it never should be so pressed as to override the greater antiquity of the word of God. After all we may talk about the fathers, we should bear in mind that there are some who are older than the fathers—men inspired by the Holy Ghost to write those Holy Scriptures given to make us wise unto salvation. I am one of those old-fashioned persons who believe thoroughly in the plenary inspiration of the word of God. I believe it is equally inspired when it is silent and when it speaks—when it omits to go deeply into some matters, and when it goes fully into others. When, therefore, I go to the word of God, and see little on points of ritual and the ceremonial of Christian worship, I feel that we should be careful not to be too positive about such matters, and should pay close attention to the simplicity of Holy Scripture. When I read the New Testament I can find nothing about altars, nothing about priests, nothing about crucifixes, nothing about lights on the communion tables, nothing about incense, nothing about priestly garments. This is the evidence of antiquity to which I think we should give special reverence—the evidence of the Holy Scriptures. My fourth remark is, that in reviewing the evidence of Christian antiquity, we must never forget the evidence of the history of experience. The experience of the Christian Church proves, that the days of the most ornate ceremonial have been days when the least good has been done in the Church, and the greatest amount of superstition and error has prevailed. The last remark I would make is, that whatever we may think of the evidence of antiquity, I hope we shall never forget what are the feelings of the great bulk of the people of England, in which we live. We have to do with a vast number of people who never read the writings of the fathers, but who are taught in our schools to read the Bible, and who go to the Bible and nothing else for guidance both as to worship and doctrine. Now when they go to the Bible, and find how simple the New Testament ritual is, we cannot be surprised that their feelings are highly offended when they imagine that practices borrowed from the Church of Rome are being pressed upon them. I have nothing more to say on this point. I regard the whole subject with the deepest possible interest, yet as full of difficulty. But I feel bound to say we should respect the feelings of our fellow-countrymen, who look back to the antiquity of three centuries, and who do not forget what the Church of Rome did to their forefathers three centuries ago. They do not forget what took place at Oxford and Smithfield, in the days of Queen Mary, and they have a very deep, intelligent, and keen dislike to anything approaching to Popery. I desire to express my respect for men with whom I do not agree upon this subject. I can respect such a man as Mr. Mackonochie, on many accounts. I admire the persistency and firmness with which he adheres to his own views. But with all my respect for the zeal of such men, I feel I should not be discharging my duty if I did not say that (whether they know it or whether they do not) their proceedings are likely to alienate many of our English people, and to harm rather than benefit the Church of England.

The Rev. C. F. Lowder.

My Lord, Ladies, and Gentlemen,—I feel it a very great privilege to stand on this platform immediately after my reverend predecessor. Differing as we do, yet he has claimed for himself and those who differ from him a patient hearing. We have, I think, and especially those who agree with me, given a very patient hearing to a great many very impatient statements which have been made by previous speakers, and therefore I trust I may claim for myself a patient hearing also. I desire entirely to conform myself to the rule laid down by the Right Reverend President of this assembly,—that those who speak should speak out their minds clearly and distinctly, and yet that we should do it with Christian patience and Christian charity. I trust I shall not transgress that rule. I desire to speak my mind, and I desire above all things to refrain from saying anything unnecessary which may hurt the feelings of a single person in this assembly. Now, I am but a poor missionary priest, and therefore you do not expect to hear from me any very learned arguments on the mere historical question as gathered from the fathers. We are told by Mr. Ryle that the testimony of the fathers is only secondary; but I am certain we have heard a great deal to-day which may teach us that there is much more to be learnt from the fathers. But though I am a poor missionary priest, and not a learned divine, yet the poor missionary priest ought to know his Bible; and I desire, by your permission, to go back to the very fundamental principle of what the worship of Almighty God really is, as handed down to us by the Bible. I have had the honour at two former Congresses of stating, more or less fully, the argument which may be called the Scriptural argument for Christian ritual; and if I in any way seem to travel over any of that ground again, it is because I know that in this Congress there are many present who were not at other Congresses; and surely an assembly of Churchmen and Churchwomen will not be impatient when they are brought back to the first principles of Holy Scripture. Now I contend that the Bible does say a very great deal indeed about Christian ritual: and I am quite content to take my stand as a Ritualist—I do not disguise what I am—I am content to take my stand, upon this platform and before this assembly, as a Ritualist simply on the Scriptural argument—the argument, that God has revealed to us in Holy Scripture the way in which He desires that He should be worshipped by men and women and children in all ages. I need only refer you, my friends, to the command which was given to Moses—"See that thou do all things after the pattern thou hast seen in the Mount." Moses came down from the presence of God that he might perpetuate by God's command on earth the worship he had seen in heaven. He built a tabernacle after God's command and after God's directions. The tabernacle represented, so far as God willed that it should be represented, the worship which had been opened to the eyes of Moses in Mount Sinai, and which had been set before him as the worship of heaven. That worship, as we know, was perpetuated in the temple. The tabernacle was the temporary place of worship, but the temple was more permanent. It was to be continued in the temple; and it was continued in the structure of the temple; it was continued in the daily sacrifices and worship of the temple; it was continued in the vestments of the priests in the temple; it was continued in the music of the temple; it was continued in the lights of the temple; it was continued in the outer courts of the temple; it was continued in the holy place, in the holy of holies of the temple: it was thus continued while the first temple lasted. It was again taken up in the second temple; and it was in that temple in which our blessed Lord was content to worship, and condescended to worship amongst men. It was continued in that temple-worship through the lives of the Apostles until that temple was destroyed. Is it not most remarkable that at the very point of time when that temple was destroyed, the revelation was opened again to St. John the Divine, and he continued to the Christian Church the revelation from Heaven itself? Is it not most remarkable that the revelation of St. John the Divine teaches us exactly the same story of the worship of heaven as Moses had seen in the Mount; as Moses had taught in the tabernacle; as had been perpetuated in the first and second temples, the very place where our blessed Lord Himself worshipped the Father? Now, my dear friends, I say it is most remarkable that we have in St. John's revelation the exact counterpart of what Moses himself saw in the Mount. But we are now told that the Epistle to the Hebrews shows all this worship has passed away. But what does the Epistle to the Hebrews teach us more than that this Jewish worship was the shadow of something to come? so that the Christian worship represents that which has been already represented. That is, the Passover was to lead us on to Jesus Christ, the true Paschal Lamb; the Passover as a type of the blessed Sacrament of our Lord's Body and Blood —the very central act of our Christian worship; so that now we are to do what our blessed Lord has told us to do, "Do this in remembrance of me." What was this? What did He do Himself? He took the bread, He blessed it, He looked up to heaven, and brake it, and gave thanks, and said to His Apostles, "Do this in remembrance of me." He did it Himself, and He bade them eat; and therefore St. Paul said, "As often as ye eat this Bread and drink this Cup, ye do show forth the Lord's death till He come." What, then, are we doing in Christian worship? We are showing forth the Lord's death; we are showing it forth in the very way in which Almighty God willed that His worship should be carried on; we are carrying it on with the vestments of the priests; we are carrying it on with the lights; we are carrying it on with the incense—that incense which St. John saw in the revelation made to him, when the angel had much incense ascending with the prayers of the saints—that incense which is so specially Scriptural—which is so Scriptural that it speaks to the hearts and consciences of any of us; that none of us can worship in the church where incense is ascending before God without feeling that our prayers must go up with that incense—that they must come out of kindled hearts,—hearts burning with love to our blessed Lord; and those are the prayers and the services which are pleasing and acceptable to Almighty God.

The Rev. George Everard, Vicar of St. Mark's, Wolverhampton.

My Lord,—I feel most deeply thankful that the prayer at the commencement of each of our sessions was added, which was not upon our Congress ticket. I earnestly desire that this prayer may be fulfilled, and that we may be united in one holy bond of truth and peace, of faith and charity. I trust that no word I may speak will in any way break one link of that blessed chain. I believe, my lord, there are two great bonds of Christian unity: and these two are love of the truth and unfeigned love of the brethren. I would ask for myself and for you, my clerical brethren, that we may be filled with the Holy Ghost, and may thus be united in love of the truth and in love one to the other. But permit me, my lord, to carry out for a little while the words already spoken with respect to the evidence of Holy Scripture in regard to this ritualistic question. I am glad that Mr. Lowder has touched upon the subject, as it gives me an opportunity of continuing it. I, like him, have to work in a large town parish, and have not much time, nor, I can say, much inclination, for the abstruse questions touched upon by some here this morning. I do feel that antiquity is important. It is silver, but it is silver mixed with dross. But I believe inspired antiquity is chiefly important, because it is silver purified seven times in the fire. It seems to me, my lord, that one single page,—one single sentence of Holy Scripture,—outweighs hundreds and thousands of pages of other antiquity. In my opinion there are two great New Testament rubrics with respect to ritual, and worship—one in regard to the inner disposition of the heart, and the other in regard to its manifestation. The one with regard to the inner spirit—"God is a spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth." That which respects its outer manifestation—"Let all things be done decently and in order." With respect to the former, when the woman of Samaria asked our Lord where worship should be offered, He answered her, "Not in Gerizim nor Jerusalem, but go to thine own heart and build an altar there. There is the altar—where prayer must be offered—where God must be worshipped." As to the outer manifestation, away with all that irreverent, slovenly, careless worship which prevails still, alas! in many of our Churches. I have seen surplices unwashed for months; I have seen frogs leaping about our English Churches. Away with all such slovenliness. God, let us remember, is to be worshipped reverently and in the beauty of holiness. Permit me for a moment to refer to the Acts of the Apostles. I have, in reference to this Congress, read that book very carefully from beginning to end. It seems to me, that very distinct and special prominence is given to prayer and to preaching the word, to baptism, and to meeting for the Lord's Supper; but I cannot find, as a plain and simple reader, in the Acts of the Apostles, anything in the very least degree to justify the eccentricities of ritual practised in these days. I find in one chapter, the eleventh, that Barnabas was a long time at Antioch, and the spirit of his exhortations to the Christians was that *with purpose of heart they would cleave unto the Lord.* He left no distinct ritual behind. I find in the fourteenth chapter, that Paul and Barnabas confirmed the infant Churches. Not a word, however, is said about ritual; they were only told *to continue in the faith.* I find in the eighteenth chapter, that Paul continued at Corinth a year and six months, and that the time was passed, not in arranging a definite ritual, but in teaching the Word of God among them. I find in the twentieth chapter, when speaking of his ministry to the Elders of Ephesus, the very substance of it all was, *repentance towards God and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ.* I find, when St. Paul was for two long years teaching the Christians of Rome, the whole message apparently there given was this—*preaching the kingdom of God and the things concerning the Lord Jesus Christ.* Permit me, my lord, more especially to ask the attention of this Congress to one point which seems to me of great importance. I would ask my Clerical brethren to contrast,—to put in most close contrast and comparison the book of Leviticus and the pastoral epistles. The one was for the teaching of the Priests under the old covenant; the others give us the exhortations of the Apostles to the ministers of Christ under the new. In the one you have every particular with reference to the minutest details; in the other there is the message. I think it may be summed up in a few short words,—"Live holily, fight manfully, endure courageously, and *preach the Word.*" What is the secret of the difference between them? It is found in the Epistle to the Hebrews. The types and shadows have passed away, the great Sacrifice has been offered, and now the one duty of Christ's Ministers is everywhere to proclaim its efficacy and invite men to partake of its benefits. There are other points I may touch upon, but I have not time to say much.

Revive the ancient faith, say some. By all means. This is what Luther did, and this is the blessing we want to preserve. It seems to me to be like some magnificent temple, whose marble pillars have been overlaid by the accretions of centuries, but when the pillars are scraped they stand forth in their pristine glory. Such is the work we wish to accomplish. We wish not to have the daubing of traditions and superstitions, but we want to have pillars of heavenly truth as the strength of our Church. Yes; revive the ancient faith; but let it be ancient enough—the faith of the Apostles and Prophets. By all means let the Priests wear vestments; but let us remember that the Priests are the true Israel of God, and that their vestments are to be the beauty of holiness; their vestments are those spoken of by the Apostles,—*put on charity, put on the new man, be clothed with humility.* By all means let us have lighted candles on the altar, but let the candle be that of divine truth shining in the human heart, and from the human heart shining forth upon the world. By all means let us have incense before the service, and in the service, and after the service, but let it be the incense of holy devotion, and loving prayer, and hearty praise. By all means let us have prostrations, but let them be the prostrations of the humble spirit; for "every one that humbleth himself shall be exalted." By all means let us have banners, but let our banner be like the Arms of the University of Oxford—an open Bible, with the motto, "The Lord is my light and salvation: whom then shal I fear?"

The PRESIDENT, at this stage of the proceedings, announced that in consequence of so many desiring to speak on this subject, only five minutes would be allowed to each speaker.

The Rev. R. F. WILSON, M.A., Vicar of Rownhams.

I AM the first victim to the five minutes' arrangement, and I shall therefore go straight to what I wish to say. Taking the three papers which stand at the head of this subject to represent to us the backbone of what we have to discuss, I think it well to point out and to suggest for your consideration whether, if there should be some (so to say) spinal curvature in one of the papers, it may not be as well at once to see whither it leads, and how far it can healthily affect our discussion.

It seems to me that Mr. Elliott's paper is entirely beside the mark of what we have met here to discuss. His argument—if I understand it rightly—is this: that, because in certain scanty architectural remains you do not find traces of such and such things having a bearing on points of doctrine, therefore these doctrines did not exist at all. Mr. Elliott takes up one single point in Christian antiquity to see what it teaches. That is an argument which may do very well if used constructively,—*i.e.*, building up from what its facts bear witness to; but used destructively,—*i.e.*, rejecting whatever its facts do not witness to—is out of place. He is endeavouring to prove a negative out of the simple perishable material of a building; and he infers the absence of a given doctrine from the Church's system, because there is no evidence of it in brick and mortar: that is to say, that whatever in regard to Christian services and doctrine has been recorded and treasured up, and has come down to us in various ways,—all this is to be set on one side, and rejected, because Mr. Elliott does not find any indications of it in that quarter to which alone he makes his appeal.

Perhaps some here may remember the eminent violinist, Paganini. His great performance was on a violin from which he had removed all the strings but one. It seems to me that Mr. Elliott is doing this very thing. He has rolled up and put out of the way the string of the ancient Christian Liturgies. He does the same as to whatever sounds may be brought out from the writings of the fathers of the early Church. He has also rolled up and put aside the string we have in the canons of the Church, which give us some information on these subjects; and then he makes certainly a remarkable performance upon the one string that remains. Passing by what may be gathered from these other contemporary sources of information which I have alluded to, he restricts his inquiries to the evidence which he collects from architectural remains. And let me observe one thing more: that the string in this matter is a very fallacious one. It is less to be trusted than any one of the others. Mr. Elliott has singled out a string, upon this point of Christian antiquity, which is the weakest of all, and for this plain reason:—How could Christians then build churches, and make architecture an embodiment of their doctrines?

Fancy sending for an architect at the time of one of the ten persecutions, and asking him to design a nice church, with a chancel and all proper appurtenances. I do not say there is nothing in the argument from buildings, but it is one to be applied with the greatest discretion.

Mr. Ryle said the Christians at first worshipped in dens and caves for security's sake. Christians did not venture unnecessarily to obtrude on public notice: it would have been to court persecution. Common prudence compelled them to withdraw their religion as much as possible from public gaze. But I must go on, because I have two or three other things to say.

I told you Mr. Elliott tied up three strings from which he should bring out sweet and inspiring strains; but I think he tied up another. I think he tied up the string of the

Bible; I do indeed. Let me ask you to remember such passages as there are in the 6th chapter of the Gospel of St. John, and in the 10th and 11th chapters of the Epistle to the Corinthians, declaring what the body and blood of Christ is—how sacred, and what it was not to discern it. It seems to me, from the way in which Mr. Elliott put forward what he said on this subject, that he neglected to consider that. And now let me remark on a faulty appeal to Scripture, which has been touched upon by one or two other speakers. It illustrates the inconsiderate way in which Scripture is sometimes brought forward.

We have heard it said that the whole Christian body are, or ought to be, kings and priests unto God, and that therefore there is no Christian priesthood; and appeal is triumphantly made to a passage in the General Epistle of St. Peter: and I have seen that passage quoted often, nay, even—if I remember rightly—by so great a man as Neander, to prove the very thing which these speakers brought it forward to prove,—namely, that there is no such thing as a Christian priesthood. Now, if you will turn to Exodus xix., you will see plainly that the Apostle had that passage in his thoughts when he wrote. There you read—"Ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation." But were there no other priests then among them? Would not a Jew have looked on any one as crazy, who argued that because God called the people a "kingdom of priests," therefore there was no special separate priesthood among them? When, therefore, Christians, as such, are called a royal priesthood, how can that prove that there is no separate order of priests in the Church?

The Rev. F. F. Goe, M.A., Vicar of Christ Church, Kingston-upon-Hull.

The evidence which Christian antiquity bears, as to Church ritual, having been so fully and exhaustively set before us by the selected speakers, I wish to draw the attention of the Congress to one aspect of the subject which has been but slightly touched upon—the value attached by our own Church to the evidence in question. When our Church undertook the weighty task of reconstructing her Prayer-Book, and thus superseding the existing service books, it was to be expected that she would introduce the new book with some account of the reasons why she was no longer satisfied with the more ancient uses. She has done so in the beautiful and scriptural chapter on ceremonies which forms part of the preface. In that chapter she not only alludes to the elaborate ceremonial of mediæval times, but also takes a general survey of the progress of Church ritual from the very first. She tells us, at the beginning of the chapter, that "of such ceremonies as be used in the Church, and have had their beginning by the institution of man, some at the first were of godly intent and purpose devised, and yet at length turned to vanity and superstition." . . . "Other there be, which, although they have been devised by man, yet it is thought good to reserve them still." This passage appears to me to express the judgment of our Church, that, with the exception of those ceremonies which were divinely prescribed in the New Testament—as in the case of water in baptism, and the partaking of bread and wine in the Lord's Supper—Church ceremonies are "of human institution,"—"devised by man;" and that therefore she was at liberty to abolish them, however ancient, if there were sufficient grounds for so doing. She paid regard to antiquity, but did not feel bound by catholic usage to retain such ceremonies as had been found injurious to the interests of true religion. She then goes on to tell us—in one of her most marked allusions to the evidence of antiquity as to ritual—that "some ceremonies are put away, because the great excess and multitude of them hath so increased in these latter days, that the burden of them was intolerable; whereof St. Augustine in his time complained, that they were grown to such a number, that the estate of Christian people was in worse case concerning that matter than were the Jews.

And he counselled that such yoke and burden should be taken away." And then she traces the evidence of antiquity higher still, and in language which brings her into direct conflict with the fundamental error of the Church of Rome—in language, too, which it is necessary to reiterate again and again in these days—she adds: "And besides this, Christ's gospel is not a ceremonial law (as much of Moses' law was), but it is a religion to serve God, not in bondage of the figure or shadow, but in the freedom of the Spirit."

From this preface, a man who had not read the Prayer-Book itself might know what sort of book it would be,—a book distinguished by the simplicity and sobriety of its ritual, and by the comparative scantiness of its rubrical directions.

But further, my lord: the evidence of Christian antiquity as to ritual goes to show, that, as corrupt doctrines crept into the Church, the ritual kept pace with those doctrines, and symbolized them. For ritual, as we are constantly being reminded, is the language of doctrine; "it symbolizes and expresses, and at the same time enshrines and protects, dogmatic truth." Hence, as our Church freed herself at the Reformation from the corrupt doctrines which had defiled her, consistency required that she should also abandon the symbolical expression of those doctrines. The abandonment of the doctrine of transubstantiation and the sacrifice of the mass necessitated the abandonment of the garb which symbolized the office of a sacrificing priest. The reformers revered antiquity, and they retained whatever was old, where they could do so consistently with their love of what was true and profitable. The Prayer-Book is an imperishable monument of this their reverence; but they refused to prefer the antiquity of ritual to the higher antiquity of Apostolic truth, as revealed in the New Testament. Can we be thankful enough for the wisdom and the courage with which—as regarded ceremonies—they snapped asunder the so-called chain of catholic continuity, which had proved so mischievous to the Church? Let us be content to tread in the path they have marked out, remembering that in the most ancient collection of documents which antiquity has handed down to us, there are but two directions as to Church ritual.—"Let all things be done unto edifying;" and "Let all things be done decently and in order."

The Rev. Mayow W. Mayow, M.A., Rector of South Heighton.

My Lord,—If this discussion had kept itself strictly to the wording of the subject, as set forth in the notice, I should not have asked to interpose in it at all. But as many of the speakers have gone from the subject of inquiry; viz., what was the Ritual of antiquity, into another—though it is very natural, perhaps, that this divergence should have occurred—as to the doctrine involved in the supposed ritual, and as to the truth or falsity of that doctrine, it seems necessary to follow up this line of argument with some reply. We have heard a great deal of the discussion turn on the question as to whether there *could be* practically any such ritual as that supposed; because, it is said, there is no priesthood, no altar, no sacrifice, and therefore nothing to need or admit any such Ritual. Bear in mind then, that the defence must follow the attack; and therefore I may be permitted to say a word or two upon this subject. We have been challenged more than once to say whether there can be any Scriptural authority for this doctrine. Mr. Ryle expressly told us that he could find nothing of the altar in the Bible. I wish for a moment on this point to arrest your attention: I must own that I have read the Bible somewhat differently. I find St. Paul tells us expressly that "we have an altar whereof they who serve the tabernacle have no right to eat." I think this is a recognition of the Christian altar; for it is not the Jewish altar. They that serve the tabernacle have no claim or part in it; and it is, I think, manifestly the altar in the Christian Church which St. Paul alluded to. But further than this—not to lay stress on a single passage—in one of the Epistles to the Corinthians, there is an elaborate argument drawn out as to the incompatibility and impossibility of worshipping at the Christian and the heathen altars. It is true that it is called in one part of that passage *a table*, for it is the table of the feast, but it is called in another verse of the same passage *the altar;* and the argument evidently is this—that, as those who join in the service at the heathen altars are partakers in the worship of devils, so those who partake of the Christian altars join in the worship of God according to Christ's religion. I defy any man to make a fair sense of the passage without a recognition of the Christian altar. But I go beyond this. I turn to a higher authority, and I find our blessed Lord says, "If thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift." I am not one who can ever believe that when our Lord gave that direction he meant it only for the Jews and during the continuance of the Jewish Church. I believe it was His intention that in the Christian Church there should be an altar, and that those who come to that altar should first be reconciled to their brother, before they come to offer at it their gift. I think it was, then, too bold and broad an assertion, that Holy Scripture contains nothing about the altar. One word further. If there be an altar, there will be a sacrifice; and if there be an altar and a sacrifice, there will be a Priest. I cannot go into detail to prove this, nor attempt here to show how this doctrine pervades the whole of the ancient liturgies. All I can say is, that the teaching of the Holy Scripture and of the usage of the whole world, Heathen, Jewish, and Christian, upon this subject, is, that where there is the one there will also be the other; and let me add, I do not understand in the slightest degree how men can take the Ordinal of the Church of England, or the Order for Visitation of the Sick, and not see that our Church recognises the office of the priesthood. People, I know, may deceive themselves into believing anything; but I cannot conceive how right-minded men should not at once perceive that of all non-natural things, and of all non-natural senses, it is the most non-natural to suppose that the Church of England does not recognise, as of the essence of her doctrine and her teaching, the office of the priesthood in all its ancient functions.

The Rev. H. B. W. Churton, M.A., Vicar of Icklesham.

If, my Lord, the subject of Processions, religious Processions, and Litanies be alien to our present debate; or if we are all agreed that Processions are not merely innocent, but, under due restriction and at befitting and special times, both cheering and edifying, I will sit down at once, and make room for the next speaker. But if there are any of our friends who regard such things as Roman and Romish rather than Scriptural, primitive, and allowable, let me offer a very few words, historical and liturgical, respecting them. Now, what was the practice of the Elder Church, the Church of our elder brother, the Israelitish people? First, the schools of the prophets in Samuel's time held processions: "Thou shalt meet a company of prophets coming down from the high place with a psaltery, and a tabret, and a pipe, and a harp before them" (1 Sam. x. 5). Secondly, in Isaiah's time, three hundred years after, they were still a custom: "Ye shall have a song, as in the night when a holy solemnity is kept; and gladness of heart, as when one goeth with a pipe to come into the mountain of the Lord, to the Mighty One of Israel" (Isa. xxx. 29). And thirdly, about three hundred years later, in Nehemiah's time, we find one half-choir under Ezra the Priest, and the other half-choir attended by that noble-hearted Layman Nehemiah, the former encircling Jerusalem from the west round by the south to the east, the latter by the north round to the east, and then both meeting together in the Temple: "They went up with the musical instruments of David the man of God, and Ezra the Scribe before them, by the fountain gate up by the stairs of the city of David, unto the water gate eastward. And the other company of them that gave thanks went over against them, and I after them" (Neh. xii. 30-43). By that beautiful and befitting text from one of the Songs of Degrees, which yonder shines over this our meeting, "BEHOLD, HOW GOOD AND HOW PLEASANT IT IS, BRETHREN, TO DWELL TOGETHER IN UNITY," I am reminded to remark that those beautiful songs were not only sung by Levites on the steps of the Temple, but by the people generally, as they came from various quarters to the chief feasts, all more or less in summer. And Psalm cxxxvi. appears to have been used by Jehoshaphat processionally before the army in going forth to battle (2 Chron. xx. 21, 22).

To come now to the Church of England:—We find first, at the beginning of the Service for the Burial of the Dead, three sentences of Scripture appointed as a processional hymn or anthem. Secondly, in the Service (so generally recognised) for the Consecration of Churches, we have Psalm xxiv. so used. And thirdly, in the Holy Order of Matrimony we have, linking together the two parts of that service, Psalm cxxvii. or lxvii. directed to be used processionally. And what is our Litany originally, but a processional supplicatory service, as the Litanies in the south of France, at Vienne and Clermont in the fifth and sixth centuries? And ought we not, in this Congress and Conference in a land of peace, even as we walk the peaceful streets around us, to pour forth from our inmost hearts as it were a perpetual Litany for that neighbour land, the historical birthplace and cradle (as it would seem) of Processional Litanies, that their present sufferings may be soothed and shortened to "all that are in danger, to all sick persons, prisoners, and captives;" and that London, equally guilty (her higher privileges being considered), may not be as Paris, and that England, equally guilty, may not be as France? It is possible, we should bear in mind, to make many thousand steps in religious processions, and yet make not one step forward in spiritual life. Let our effort be, that both these may be united together—that, as we "go on" with singing or supplication "from company to company," we may also, by God's inspiring and guiding spirit, "go on from strength to strength."

The Rev. R. C. BILLING, M.A., Holy Trinity, Louth.

THERE is just one word I should like to say in reference to what fell from Mr. Mayow. He alluded to the Communion office of the Church of England, and, as I understood, he said no one could honestly believe that there is no altar, no priesthood, and no sacrifice in the ministration at the Lord's table of the ordinance of the Church of England. Now, what I say is this. It is a fact which that gentleman seems to have overlooked that the term "altar" was indeed in the Communion office *before the Reformation*, but the term "altar" was purposely excluded by our reformers, and we have nothing there but "Table," "the Lord's Table," "the Holy Table," provided for "the Lord's Supper"—"a heavenly feast," "a banquet of most heavenly food." That gentleman said—and I quite agree with him—that if we have an "altar" we must have a "sacrificing priesthood," and we must have "a sacrifice;" but as we have no "altar," I maintain, my lord, that we have also no "sacrificing priesthood"—no "Sacerdos"—in the reformed Church of England; and that no sacrifice, no "host"—no "sacrificial victim," is offered on any material altar. One word more I should like to say in regard to what fell from Archdeacon Freeman and from another gentleman in one of the opening papers. It was stated—but I dispute the point—that the Church of England refers for her ritual to antiquity; and by "antiquity," judging from instances cited, primitive time was not intended. I say the Church of England holds and teaches that it is right and proper for every national Church to order its own ritual, and that the Church of England refers primarily to the Word of God. I came to the Congress Hall this morning expecting to hear a great deal advanced as to the evidence of Christian ritual out of the Word of God. I go away, so far as this is concerned, fully confirmed in my own mind in what I felt when I entered the hall, that there is nothing found there to justify the course pursued by those who would force upon us a ritual which I, for one, believe not only to be derogatory to the simplicity of Christian worship, but intended to symbolize what the Church of England disavows, and from which she purged herself at the Reformation—which is dangerous to the souls of men, and which, I am happy, for one, to believe is certainly not relished by the Laity of England.

The Rev. C. D. GOLDIE, M.A., Vicar of St. Ives, Hunts.

I WILL say very little in reference to the remarks of those who have preceded me, except this—that, in allusion to the gentleman who found out that the same word was used in regard to the Passover and the Holy Communion—they *did*, *i.e. sacrificed*, the Passover, and, *do* this in remembrance of me—if to *do* means to *sacrifice* in the former case—then clearly, in some sense at any rate, the Blessed Sacrament is a Sacrifice. The question is asked —Where are we to find statements in Scripture in regard to ritual? Let us remember this: that most of the early writings of the fathers, and almost all the apostolical epistles were written to confront error. The fact, then, that there is no epistle having as its main subject the Holy Eucharist, only proves this: that no error existed in the early Church with regard to this truth. The great reason—and here I would speak with all reverence—why in the New Testament we find so little upon ritual, as compared with the Book of Leviticus in the Old Testament, arises from this fact, that the Jews worshipped a Spirit-God, and in so worshipping God it was needful that their ritual should be laid out in all its particularity. There was no seed from which ritual would spring. But the Christian, on the other hand, worships a man-God, and that great truth of the incarnation is the root of all ritual. For what is the truth of the incarnation but this—that God Almighty has become man—that the immaterial and the material are united in the person of our dear Lord? Given this as the one root of all Church doctrine and Church truth, all ritual will be but the emanation from this great truth—a clothing of the Spiritual with material acts and ceremonies; and the ritual of the Holy Eucharist, or any other ritual the Church uses, will naturally arise from the great fact of the Incarnation. I believe that the great truth, of God and man united in Christ, works out in all the ritual of the Church, and that the Spirit is given in those services with which the Church abounds, and which the Church—partly from the Divine mouth itself, and partly from the power given her of working out the salvation of the world—sets forth before her people. I have one word more to say. The gentleman who preceded me talked about one party in the Church forcing a ritual on the other. I always thought it was the other party who were trying to force us *not* to have ritual. It seems to me that whatever force there has been —whatever legal trials there have been—have come from one side—from the party opposed to ritualism.

The Rev. W. W. MALET, Vicar of Ardeley.

I SUPPOSE that those things St. Paul said he would set in order when he came, alluded somewhat to a ritual in the Church. I suppose, too, that, when St. Augustine came to Canterbury, he had a grand procession and litanies, and exhibited a ritual. And I also suppose, that, when he baptized the King of the Saxons, there was a ritual in connection with that baptism. I have not heard anything said of the ritual of Baptism yet. The remarks seem to have been confined to the ritual of the Eucharist. But is there not a ritual in the lesser Sacrament of Baptism? I suppose the object of this discussion is to elicit observations on the different modes of ritual. And here I may observe that in baptizing in the Eastern Church they immerse a child at eight days old, while in the Western Church no doubt they did so formerly (as we are commanded primarily to do in our Church of England); though there is this difference in that Church—in Milan they baptize by plunging the head into the water, not the whole body; in the other part of the Western Church—the Roman Church,—they do it by sprinkling, as we generally do now; but we ought, as a rule, to plunge the child under water (which might be warmed), as any one could do in that splendid old font in the Church of St. Michael in this town. In regard to the greater Sacrament we have this authority in the Book of Malachi—"From the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same my name shall be great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense shall be offered unto my name, and a pure offering: for my name shall be great among the heathen, saith the Lord of Hosts." Here is a direct prophecy that incense should be used in the commemorative Christian sacrifice—the Eucharist—called by the Western Church the Mass, from the Hebrew for oblation, "massah." Allow me to speak a little more of the antiquity, as witness my own parish. I have found in the Royal Record Office a list of the articles of ritual used in my own Church, at Ardeley, Herts. The list bears date 1549, the time of Edward VI., and includes vestments of divers colours, altar cross, two candlesticks, and a censer for the incense; and this, I think, proves a little antiquity for these things, though only of some 300 years or a little more. Well, when I was in Jerusalem, three years ago, I found that the Greek Church never dared to offer "the mystery," as they call the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, without incense. You know that the Roman Church in "low mass" have no incense; but in the Eastern Church the presence of God is regarded as there; and where God is, there is the incense; they have no such thing as "*low mass.*" And is it not a fact, that our blessed Lord said, "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them?" To whom do we offer incense but to God, and for His honour? for, that incense should be offered to no one but God, we read in the Holy Scriptures. Well then, as I wished specially to speak of the antiquity of incense in the holiest rites of our faith, and to prove it not Roman, but Catholic, I found in Jerusalem that the use of incense prevailed in all the Eastern Churches—Greek orthodox, Armenian, Syrian, Coptic, and Abyssinian; however much they may differ from each other in some respects of ritual, they claim it as handed down from the early Christian times.

The Rev. C. PERCIVAL PHINN, M.A., Rector of Critchill More.

FIRST of all, as to the evidence of *Holy Scripture*, which has been, rightly I think, brought in as truly belonging to our "Christian antiquity." It has been urged by Mr. Lowder, in the first place, that Moses in the mount received the pattern for the worship of the Israelites. Perfectly true; but he implied that Moses saw in the mount the worship that went on in heaven. If you read your Bibles, however, I do not think you will find that that is a justifiable conclusion. God gave him the pattern for the worship of Israel, but we are not told that that was the worship going on at that time in heaven. Then, again, I come to the New Testament, and I find on this point the same thing has been casually referred to, though I believe it has been exploded at one of our Congresses before,* I mean in reference to the worship seen in heaven, as recorded by St. John in the Revelation. But is that necessarily a pattern given for us to worship exactly like it on earth?

* By Canon Bernard, Wolverhampton.

Read the Revelation, and see if any man will presume to carry it out in our churches now. No one has dared to do so, no one will; so let us give up that argument. Then as to other parts of the New Testament. Our blessed Lord's words have been quoted as to leaving the gift "before the altar." True, there was an altar then, but it was a Jewish altar. The Christian Church had not yet been established. Are we really to draw from that phrase any necessary conclusion that there must be, or is it reasonable to suppose that there is, a *Christian* altar, because our blessed Lord spoke to the Jews about what was their duty before going to *their* altar? Again, in the Epistle to the Corinthians, Mr. Mayow, I think, referred to the passage where the Apostle speaks both of a Table and of an Altar;* but he did not tell you distinctly what your Bible says, and what you will find on referring to the passages, that the Old Testament priests are there described as those who "waited at the altar," but Christian ministers who are compared with them, and mentioned in the same paragraph, are "they which preach the Gospel"—not, who "wait at the *Christian* altar." There is no such expression in the New Testament. Then, again, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, we have that expressed which is perfectly certain and true, "we have an altar." Yes, we have an altar,—but will any one read that passage as really meaning that the Apostle is necessarily speaking about ritual? No, he was speaking of that which for us takes the place of the altar under the Jewish dispensation—the Cross of Christ.† That expression cannot then prove that, strictly speaking, our Holy Table ought to be called an Altar. Then, coming to the evidence of the Prayer Book, I was struck, in the opening papers by Mr. Perry and Archdeacon Freeman, with the reference made to the Church of England's appeal to Antiquity for her ritual. I say that you will find that most satisfactorily answered if you refer to the Preface to our Prayer-Book, and judge for yourselves. The Church of England does not in any way, in accordance with what is done in the present day, appeal in that sense to Christian Antiquity. Then, again, we hear much of *Catholic* Antiquity. Now, Mr. Malet and others said that matters are conducted differently in different Churches, in the East, and in the West. Where is the Catholicity, then? There is no such thing; there is scarcely any detail you can find, having had anything like Catholic acceptance. Again it has been said to-day (what has often been said before), that the agreement of the Primitive Liturgies affords certain proof; but the answer to that would be, that those Liturgies have been interpolated to an immense extent, and it is impossible to place them therefore on the footing of Gospels.

The PRESIDENT.

WISH, before parting, to express my thanks to the readers, speakers, and listeners, for the self-restraint they have exercised this morning, during the discussion of these matters. I trust that while none may go away with their general opinion on this subject altered, all will go away with this conviction strengthened in their minds, that the brethren amongst us who object the most earnestly to ritual, do it from no wish to make the services bare or poor; but from the fear—be it right or wrong—of interposing a mist, with its varying colours, between the souls of the worshippers and Christ. And that, on the other hand, those of our brethren who desire to carry on a ritual in their Churches to the highest point allowed by the reformed Church of England,—for I have not a word to say of any one else,—have, equally with their brethren, a desire to promote the approach of the worshipper's soul to Christ alone; but that they believe that the soul may be aided in that approach by a more abundant use of the outward machinery than their brethren would allow. Now, if we go away with this conviction strengthened in our minds, while each of us must strive for his own view of the truth, he may, I think, go away determined to strive for it with more love and forbearance to his brethren who on either side differ from him, and with a greater care for the future of his words spoken or his words written, lest he should break the law of charity, which is written in larger letters than any rubric.

---

* 1 Cor. ix. 13, 14, with x. 18, 21.

† See Alford, on Heb. xiii. 10; and our Reformers, *passim*.

THURSDAY AFTERNOON, 13th OCTOBER.

The Right Rev. the PRESIDENT took the chair at 2 o'clock.

THE EFFECT OF THE INCREASED CULTIVATION OF PHYSICAL SCIENCE AND OF LITERARY AND OTHER RESEARCH ON BIBLICAL CRITICISM AND BELIEF.

The Rev. J. H. TITCOMB, M.A., Vicar of St. Stephen's, South Lambeth, read the following paper:—

MANY of my brethren are, no doubt, aware that St. Augustine used to pronounce faith in the Antipodes heresy, and that St. Hilary maintained salt to be a compound of fire and water. I need not say that in those days Biblical criticism stood in little danger of attacks from science. Ever since the time of Galileo, however, those two forces have not only been in antagonism, but in growing antagonism. That growth has been slow; but, like all intellectual revolutions, it has been progressive and diffusive; ending, at the extremes on either side, in a hard implacable enmity which has often pronounced itself irreconcileable. If I interpret my thesis rightly, then, the question before us is—Will the future development of science and of other branches of learning bring the Bible and Scientific research into greater unity? Or must we expect their present aspects of separation to be still more deepened and diversified?

In taking up this inquiry, although I wish to reason both with caution and modesty, I cannot speak under panic. On the contrary, looking at the present state of science, and judging of its further progress from that which is past, I venture to predict *three* effects upon Biblical criticism, every one of which will, I think, make the Believer's position stronger.

These effects may be summed up for convenience under three typical words—Hesitation, Verification, and Modification.

I. *Hesitation*,—by which I mean that we shall increasingly find grounds to hesitate, before acknowledging any of the allegations of scientific scepticism.

This opinion is based upon the fact that some of the sciences are, at present, in a transitional state. In Geology, for example, we have lately seen the accepted facts of one generation displaced by the subsequent discoveries of another. Thus, a few years ago it would have been high treason against science to speak of the older rocks as fossiliferous. Nevertheless, recent discoveries in Canada have compelled Geologists to reverse their belief, and to trace the existence of organic remains as coeval with, if not anterior to, the formation of the crystalline rocks.

In a similar manner it used to be held that no mammals existed before the tertiary formations of the Paris basin, whereas now they have been discovered in the coal; that no copper existed in rocks of a later age than the slate, whereas it is now worked in the tertiaries; that no analogues to the chalk existed in modern times, whereas chalk is now being deposited at the bottom of the Atlantic; that all granite was of fiery origin, whereas some has lately been shown to have resulted from aqueous deposition.

Similar shiftings of modern opinion may be traced in the progress of other sciences, although in a less degree. Thus Archæology no longer regards the Megalithic remains of Britain as Druidical. Astronomy does not now speak philosophically of fixed stars; nor of the Sun itself as without motion. Botany refuses any longer to call hemlock poison. Biology repudiates the old theory of spontaneous generation.

If, then, in so many departments of scientific inquiry, former hypotheses are gradually exploding, ought not theologians as well as philosophers to learn a lesson of caution? If opinions which are considered well established at one time have to be altered on a new set of grounds at another, may we not reasonably hesitate before we are made either angry or sad at any alleged discrepancies between Scripture and Science? That was a fine saying of the ancients, "God is patient, because He is eternal." It is an attribute of Truth also. Truth, when attacked by error, can well afford to wait; because, during the progress of ages, all mistaken deductions naturally become corrected through a larger accumulation of facts.

We claim, therefore, a rational and well-grounded right to suspend our judgment as to the alleged discrepancies between Science and Scripture; not basing this claim on imagination, still less upon ignorance or any desire to resist the triumphs of scientific discovery; but simply on the facts of the case as they actually pass before our eyes.

This reasoning, however, affords us, at the best, but negative advantage. Let us come, therefore, to another effect of the future, which I sum up under the word—

II. *Verification,*—by which I mean that we have clear prospective evidences of increased verifications of Scripture.

Taking the Mosaic cosmogony, for instance, and considering that the object of God's Word was not to present us with any strictly scientific views of Creation, but chiefly with its moral aspects, it is perfectly wonderful how modern discovery has confirmed some of the leading statements of Moses. Thus, when the late Dr. Prevost of Geneva proved that the globules of blood in mammals were distinct in structure from the globules of blood in birds and fishes; and again, when Professor Huxley, in some of his communications to the Geological Society, adduced evidences of affinity between the Dinosaurian reptiles and birds; how wonderfully both these philosophers were verifying what Moses wrote of the fourth day's work in Creation, in which a distinct origin is ascribed to mammals, while those of birds and fishes are specially correlated! In the same way, when the progress of science teaches us that the nucleus of the sun is opaque, its light being radiated from a luminous envelope, how forcibly such a fact confirms the language of Moses, which employs a Hebrew word for the sun, implying that it is a *bearer* of light, rather than essential light itself!

If we pass to pre-historic Archæology, let it be observed that the universal priority of a Stone Age, indicating the existence of a rude and uncultivated epoch antecedent to that of a higher material civilization, is a discovery not only not inconsistent with the Bible, but actually necessary for its verification,—the 4th chapter of Genesis implying most clearly that at least seven generations followed the Fall before anything was worked in metals.

What if we enter the fields of scientific exploration? Ever since the time of Belzoni and Champollion, through whose labours the walls of Karnak were found to verify the spoiling of Jerusalem by Shishak, as related in the First Book of Kings, up to the present moment, when the Moabitish Stone proclaims the historical character of another portion of the same book, we have seen little less than one long-continued series of magnificent confirmations of Scripture statements. In the short time now available, who can enumerate them? Some are *geographical;* as when Layard proved Nineveh to be a city of three days' journey, according to the statement of Jonah. Others are *ethnological* and *philological;* as when the old Assyrian tongue was demonstrated by Rawlinson to have been Semitic rather than Aryan, exactly as represented in Genesis x. 22; or when the older Babylonian empire was shown to have had an Ethiopic origin, from the relationship of many of its words to those still used in Abyssinia and among the Galla tribes, exactly as described in Genesis x. 8-10. Others are *historical;* as when the names of Sargon and Belshazzar, hitherto found only in the Bible, were identified among the palæographical records of Babylon itself. The fact of Daniel having made Belshazzar the last king of Babylon, apparently in contradiction to the testimony of Herodotus and Berosus, has often been the subject of sceptical attack. Yet the name of this king is now found actually recorded on the monuments associated with his father on the throne at the time of Babylon's fall. Can any vindication of Scripture be more minute or notable?

And what shall we say if we transfer our thoughts from these points to the strictures of modern criticism on the historical narratives of the Gospels? Is it too much to declare that, after the facts and documents of the New Testament have been subjected to a scrutiny more severe and exhaustive than was ever exhibited in any forensic trial, the result has been favourable to Christianity? During the last century infidels pronounced Christianity to be a mere imposture. They are now obliged to confess that, at least, it has an historical basis. And although they contend that the first facts of Christianity became gradually transformed by myths and legends into the supernatural history of our present Gospels, yet, as dates and facts are more thoroughly examined, admissions have to be made, even by the most remorseless critics, which balance more in favour of our own views than of theirs. This is the case with Rénan's work on St. Paul. Strauss, too, in his recent "Life of Jesus," assigns a far higher value to the historical Gospels than he allowed in his great work published thirty years ago.

Arguing, therefore, upon the future by analogies from the past, I infer that what has been will be; in other words, that the Bible will be continually gaining fresh verifications through the progress of scientific research.

We must not expect, however, to break through our adversaries' lines at every point, and surrender nothing to the advance of science. This surrender, indeed, has already taken place on some points. Do we, for example, now think it needful to believe that the sun revolves round the earth, simply because the Bible describes Joshua as calling upon that luminary to stand still? On the contrary, we frankly accept the description as one which depicts the phenomenon in popular language, according to appearance rather than reality; and we cast away the old line of Patristic criticism, on the authority of a scientific fact which has been thoroughly and unmistakably demonstrated.

Guided, then, by such reflections, I would venture to suggest a third probable effect of the future, summing it up under the typical word—

III. *Modification,*—by which I mean that we may possibly have to meet the coming discoveries of science by modifying in a similar manner other old lines of Biblical criticism and belief.

Hitherto, for example, we have reckoned the existence of man on the globe as ranging within six thousand years. Modern science urges an indefinitely extended period. Hitherto, also, we have believed in six distinct and independent acts of Divine creation. Modern science urges upon us a belief in one primeval act of elementary creation, continuously enlarged and developed through a series of slow but systematic evolutions.

Now, I am by no means saying that these theories are adequately established; nor, indeed, that they ever will be. Yet it becomes us, as sincere inquirers after truth, not to be too self-confident. We should consider rather whether, in view of the possibility of such an event, we may not have (as in the case of the sun's revolution round the earth) to modify some of our old lines of Biblical criticism and belief. If there be no *a priori* reason against such modifications, the acknowledgment of our willingness to make them would certainly be useful. Narrow dogmatism, based on the mere opinions of our forefathers, is doing much more mischief to religion than some of us are willing to allow; alienating us from many sincere inquirers after philosophic truth, and unnecessarily forcing them into an attitude of hostility to revelation. Why should we blame such persons for differing from us? Their duty as philosophers is simply to pursue research upon the evidences immediately before them, without any regard to consequences; they are only responsible when they generalize too quickly and speak with too much boastfulness, under the influence of hasty inductions and of wild imaginations. If, however, it should be found that science at last unmistakably demonstrates facts which are antagonistic to our popular opinions, it is not the philosophers who should be attacked, but those mistaken and too dogmatic interpretations of Biblical criticism which have been handed down to us from past ages; a consideration which is of the greatest advantage, inasmuch as it liberates Science on the one hand from needless charges of scepticism, and Religion on the other from any unnecessary impeachment of bigotry and intellectual obstructiveness.

Let us, therefore, be neither despairing nor defiant. Let the task of modern Theology be to convince philosophers that although Revelation reposes on a scientific basis of belief, yet its appointed mission is to teach men spiritual rather than physical truths. As for the secrets of science, they are discoverable by human reason; whereas revelation is the communication of truths which had otherwise been unknown to reason. Not being designed, therefore, to speak upon other subjects with exact scientific accuracy (but only with that amount of accuracy which the circumstances of the time and case allowed), Scripture is so far independent of all research into physical science, and can watch its progress without fear.

If theologians would only unite with philosophers on this platform, the future would be full of hope. Each then working in the same great quarry of truth—only on different sides and at different angles—might alike leave the other alone, and await the result of their labours without ill-will or jealousy. On the side of the Church, I believe such a course alone offers conciliation without compromise. On the side of the World, it can alone induce philosophers to be respectful toward Scripture, and assist in the restoration of their faith. Meanwhile, how blessed it is to feel that, amidst the ever-shifting tides of human opinion, Divine revelation stands like a rock—impregnable and unassailable—sheltering the believer in every storm, and securing for him—through the power and love of Christ—an unchanging and everlasting rest!

The Rev. Dr. HANNAH, late Warden of Trinity College, Glenalmond, Vicar of Brighton, read the following paper:—

YOUR lordship referred, at the outset of our proceedings, to a charge which is often brought against the Clergy, that in dealing with the controversies of the day, they meet needle-guns with bows and arrows, or other weapons of old-fashioned warfare. We shall all be agreed that, as generally used, this metaphor is doubly unjust; first, because it implies—what we should be sorry to admit—that our relations with the spirit of the age are generally hostile; and next, because the Clergy are as anxious as their neighbours to use the best and latest weapons of precision, when hostilities can no longer be avoided. The subject assigned to me will enable me to offer some suggestions on both these topics.

We acknowledge our obligation to modern researches, whenever we assume that they throw light upon the Scripture narrative; and if we admit that they may influence our methods of exposition, we are bound to stipulate that the laws of reasoning shall be most strictly followed; and especially that neither side shall attempt to enforce its own mere opinions or theories against the established facts of the other party.

But illustrations from history and illustrations from science stand on so different a level, that they seem to require a separate treatment;

and on this occasion I propose to confine myself to the scientific question. A large part of Scripture is itself pure history, distinguished only from other history by the constant interpretation of the inspiring Spirit. It follows that it has an immediate connection with all other ancient records through its human side; and that the discovery of fresh facts and monuments belonging to the races who dwelt around the chosen nation, as well as a more complete exploration of the land of Palestine, will throw a direct and important light on its historical framework; though, of course, it cannot help us to elucidate that higher portion of the sacred narrative in which the Holy Spirit lifts the veil that hides the course of Providence, and makes known to man the secret purposes of God.

But the case is entirely different if we turn to science, which is so far from lying, like history, by the side of Scripture, that the two subjects must be studied by directly opposite methods, which should be carefully distinguished and defined. Scientific truth rests on discovery, while Scripture truth rests on revelation; and these two modes of acquiring knowledge proceed in an exactly inverted order. The truths of revelation are simply free gifts from God; and the work of the receiving mind is limited to the task of moulding them by the conditions of the human intellect, and reproducing them in a communicable form. In revelation, then, the entire outlines of Divine truth are bestowed, at each fresh stage, at the beginning of the process, which is afterwards of an almost purely deductive character. But the chief truths of science lie rather at the end than the beginning; they cannot be reached without a toilsome journey; and to those who seek them they at first resemble distant summits, towards which the explorer presses forward as his remote reward. The scientific method, therefore, is to a great extent tentative. One of its chief instruments is hypothesis, by the help of which the man of science tries to force his way through the uncertain to the certain; so that even the more exact physical sciences, during their period of growth and increase, are surrounded by a fringe of theory, which for the time remains unproved. That fringe of theory can find no parallel in any part of Scripture; and whatever may be its value as an instrument of discovery, it is simply worthless if offered as a test of truth.

Let us further observe that, within the circle of the physical sciences, the enlargement of any one science is generally accompanied by the elucidation of others, as would happen in the case of parallel histories. These sciences all form a sisterhood of knowledge; and the whole group is enriched and elevated when any single member is promoted. But the truths of revelation stand outside, or as we should say above, that circle; and therefore might be expected to possess less interest in this advantage. Whatever growth of illumination, whatever widening of sacred knowledge, may be traced as we unroll the record of successive revelations; whatever advances we may make in theological insight, by the help of devout meditation, of a keener philology, or of legitimate development—theology must always seem stationary to the scientific mind. The only movement it admits is so guarded and limited that science hesitates to recognise it as movement at all. Here, then, we find a further difficulty which did not meet us in the case of history. What relations but those of simple contrast can be discovered between the fixed body of truth which God gave us in Scripture, and which the Church has remoulded in her Creeds and forms, and that widening range of knowledge which builds itself on fresh discoveries, and glories to reduce fresh masses of observations under the supremacy of simpler laws? I think we can discover such relations, both of principle and detail—advantages which the work of Scripture exposition may derive, both from the principles in which all science culminates, and from the details in which its researches have thrown light on portions of the Bible narrative.

1. As to principles: let us not hesitate to claim our full share in the blessings of that enlarged intellectual horizon by which God has rewarded the labours of His scientific servants. Aristotle long ago taught us to discriminate between the special sciences, and that wisdom or philosophy which gathers into one whole their highest truths, and shines in clearer light above them all. That higher sphere of thought, which broods over the whole sisterhood of sciences, which receives fresh light from each extension, and then distributes it again to every other branch of knowledge,—that higher sphere of thought is the proper home of revelation; and it is a distinct gain to theology when the Divine message can adjust itself to new machinery; has larger wheels of thought to move; has deeper channels of intelligence to fill. The truth itself gains force and clearness from the improvement in its expression; and the message assumes a more commanding tone when the narrowness of its first conception has been widened. Let us take for instance the chief propositions which are suggested by the Creed, in the titles of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. "The Maker of heaven and earth" becomes a description of wider range, and greater height and depth of meaning, now that astronomy has enlarged our knowledge by displaying the countless multitude of other worlds, and unfolding the vastness of the universe. Redemption is felt to be an act of still greater condescension and more unspeakable love, now that the same science has taught us to realise the small proportions of our own world, and the comparative insignificance of our fallen race and of its home. We may perhaps expect that the "Lord and Lifegiver" will become a phrase of richer significance if ever the hopes of Biology are fulfilled, by a clearer explanation of the origin and laws of life. Our faith in God's creating agency receives confirmation and illustration from the last of the messages we have received from science, through one of her most lucid exponents: the admission that her sober proof, somewhat to the disappointment of her sanguine expectation, requires a separate impulse for the germ of life; an impulse which we can find no reason to think that matter could furnish, but which is instantly accounted for if we admit the creating fiat of a Personal God. It is a curious instance of unexpected inconsistency, that this same clearest of teachers, who once called "blind faith the one unpardonable sin,"[*] should yet ask us, in this more recent address, to accept a blind expectation, which the whole tenor of his reasoning tends to negative, as "an act of philosophical faith."[†]

2. When we pursue the subject into smaller details, we find it neces-

---

[*] Huxley, *Lay Sermons*, etc., p. 21.

[†] *Id.*, Address at Liverpool, as President of the British Association.

sary to distinguish between the framework of Scripture and its substance. The substance is always Divine and eternal, and lies wholly beyond the jurisdiction or intervention of science. The framework was originally local and temporary; and the Church can remould its own comments without infringing on the substance, in harmony with successive intellectual movements. The ordinary relations between Scripture and science must be of a comparatively incidental character. We shall probably all admit that Scripture was not meant to teach us science; but perhaps we do not always bear in mind the full import of that admission. With few, if any, exceptions, scientific phrases used in Scripture are nothing more than portions of the current language of the times when they were used. They are like marks or counters, employed without reference to their original connotation; just as we use the words "sunrise" or "sunset" to denote points of time in the day, without dreaming that we thereby commit ourselves to an exploded astronomical opinion. In Scripture, just as everywhere else, such phrases make no scientific assertion, and therefore cannot be open to any scientific contradiction. They deal merely with the phenomenal surface of nature; with the bare external facts which supply the scaffolding or framework for the narrative. Increased scientific light enables us to translate these phrases into clearer language, and to admire the facility with which the narrative will lend itself to the expressions which advancing knowledge teaches us to use.

It will be seen at once that this rule is a mere extension of the well-established principle, that in Scripture exposition we must distinguish between what is *literally* true, and what is only *phenomenally* or *representatively* true; just as no one ever gives a literal interpretation to the human words applied to Deity: the eye, the ear, the hand of God. All eternal realities must submit in some degree to this kind of economy when they are presented in a temporal aspect; and the realities disclosed by recent science could only be spoken of under a similar economy so long as they remained unknown. Yet at every stage it has cost some effort to wrench men away from the bare literal acceptation of discarded scientific phrases, which can be readjusted without the slightest injury to the substance of the record. The most recent example is, perhaps, also the most crucial; I mean the account given of Creation in the first chapter of Genesis. If we read that passage in its proper character,—as a theological revelation, not a lesson in science,—as a disclosure of God's method and purpose in Creation,—the power of His creating word, the wise arrangements of His creating love,—we shall cease to be perplexed by such purely formal questions as whether the word "day" must be taken in its narrow human sense, or in that broader and more Divine sense in which "one day is with the Lord as a thousand years,"* or as an indefinite period of time. The whole passage is penetrated with a worthier meaning, if we regard it, not as an anticipation of geology, to which character it makes not the smallest pretension, but as a lesson which is more Divine than the most perfect geology—as the revealed account of the several impulses by which God introduced the successive momenta of nature. Such are the principle of light, the expanse of the firmament, the fixing of the solid earth; such are the acts of the Divine will, by which light was gathered into luminaries, and heaven and sea and land were peopled; such more particularly was the gift of organic life to plants, and of animal life to animated races, and of reason to mankind; by which last act the earthly structure of existence received its crown, when man was created in the image of God. Take all this in its largest sense, as the form in which God taught the lesson of that great creative week of work, which was to be the heavenly model for man's daily labour and man's weekly rest,* and you will certainly escape all collision with science, while you will gain a sounder elucidation for the details of the record, than if you wasted your time in trying to "reconcile" the incommensurable. Or examine in this light the words in which Scripture states the creation of man: "The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul."† Here "the dust of the ground" may be reasonably expounded in a larger sense, of those primary material elements which are now known to constitute the physical basis of life. And what clearer phrase than that Divine inbreathing of the breath of life could be found to describe that vital principle which has proved so perplexing to scientific controversialists, who are even yet disputing whether life is "a form or mode of ordinary force," or whether it is not rather "a power distinct and apart from the forces of the non-living world, and not to be derived from any of them, or converted into one of them."‡ We may apply the same method to all those passages of Scripture which rest upon or illustrate the revelation of Genesis; such as parts of the Book of Job, or the 33rd, the 74th, the 90th, and the 104th Psalms, or the 8th chapter of Proverbs; and we shall everywhere find that the narrow literal interpretation gives a far less worthy sense than what has been called the representative; and that the substance of the teaching comes out more clearly when we accept from science a more elevated conception of the terms in which it is expressed. The same mode of exposition has been applied to passages which deal with the anatomy and structure of our own bodies; proving, not indeed that Scripture anticipated any secrets which maturer science would disclose, but that it bears witness to the supervision of the illuminating Spirit by using language that lends itself more readily to the elucidations of science than the language of those early speculations to which the protection of inspiration was wanting.

---

* 2 Peter iii. 8.

I proceed, in conclusion, to suggest a few brief cautions on the conditions under which we should avail ourselves of these services from science.

1. We must be careful not to mix up scientific elucidations with the labours of philology, which are exclusively governed by laws of their own. It is the part of philology, to enable us to form an exact conception of the literal meaning of the sacred record. It is the part of scientific elucidation, to point out cases where that literal meaning was originally coloured by a theory which is now superseded. These functions are perfectly distinct, and must never be confounded. The

---

* Exodus xx. 11; xxxi. 17.

† Genesis ii. 7.

‡ Dr. Lionel S. Beale, in *Fortnightly Review* for September, 1870, p. 249.

one is confined to the interpretation of the text; the other should be confined to the explanations of the comment. It is only when the literal sense has been decided by the best resources of scholarship, that we may allow scientific considerations to enter and determine whether the phrase may not be advantageously transmuted in our comments into a different set of scientific symbols.

2. If we are solicitous, in our own part of the work, to distinguish between the text and the comment, and to avoid the mistake of defending a human explanation as if it were the word of God, we have a right to require that scientific men shall be equally careful to distinguish between the facts which they have proved, and the theories by which they are feeling their way to further discoveries. It is probable that much of the misunderstanding which has existed between theologians and men of science has arisen from the attempt to clothe the tentative and unverified theories of science with that character of certainty and exactness, which belongs solely to its facts and laws. And here let us acknowledge, in passing, our gratification that a well-known lecturer on these topics, who has sometimes used hard and unjust words about the Clergy, has recently recognised our willingness to give a patient hearing even to the boldest theories of science; admitting that we "have nerve enough to listen to the strongest views which" men of science "care to utter," and to "look" a strange theory "in the face," and "smite it," if we "do not like it, with honest secular strength."* This is really the whole concession that we care to accept: the admission that we do not allow that noblest of impulses, "the love of truth," to be overborne, as well as tempered, by its indispensable companion, "the fear of error." Only let both sides acquiesce in this necessary caution, that each shall rest solely on what they respectively know and can prove,—men of science from discovery, theologians from revelation; and that both shall discountenance the injustice of carrying a needless war into a neighbour's country by making groundless attacks on uncongenial methods.

3. Lastly, let us all recognise and uphold that liberty of independent working, which scientific labourers are prompt to claim, but not always equally ready to concede to theologians, whose rights are as indefeasible as theirs. We profess to found theology on a basis of proved revelation, interpreted by scientific methods of its own, and confirmed by the presence of God's Holy Spirit, and by proofs of Divine agency in the march of history and in the consciences of men. We consider that no clergyman was ever more unjust in trying to abridge the possibilities of science, than are men of science in limiting the possibilities of religion to "worship, 'for the most part of the silent sort,' at the altar of the Unknown and Unknowable." † The spheres of science and religion meet in man; but they rest on independent bases, and connect themselves with distinct portions of his compound nature. However extensive may be the conquests of science, the distinction between mind and matter is not likely, I think, to be obliterated at present; and the will of man, with all that it implies, remains as an outpost of the spiritual within the lines of the material.

---

* Professor Tyndall "On the Scientific Use of the Imagination," p. 34.
† Huxley, *Lay Sermons*, etc., p. 20.

So long as that will resists the solvent of material analysis, it continues to supply a starting-point from which we may rise to the length and breadth of that Divine knowledge which centres round the will of God. To those who deny the possibility of that knowledge, we can only reply in St. Paul's words to the Athenians: "Him whom ye worship ἀγνοοῦντες—as though expressly calling Him Unknown—Him declare we unto you."* The analogy of our own control over the processes of nature may teach us that the reign of law is not mechanical, but is the wise administration of a Personal Will. The spheres of religion and science, then,—to use a recent phrase—are "complementary, not antagonistic."† On the one side spreads the dominion of physical science, with its wide range, its lofty abstractions, its material blessings: on the other side, and complementary to this, rises the spiritual kingdom of conscience and morality, of faith and religion; the home of revelation and miracle, of prayer and sacraments and grace; a sphere in which the knowledge is at least as certain, and the method at least as rigorous, as the method which guides men of science to their conquests, and the knowledge which is their purest reward.

The Rev. E. Garbett, M.A., Vicar of Christchurch, Surbiton, read the following paper:—

That the effect of the scientific and literary culture of the day has been very advantageous to Bible criticism and to belief, I for one, most willingly and gratefully admit. Religion, viewed on its intellectual side, is not without its dangers. Our confidence in divinely revealed truth may run into a narrow stiffness of assertion, and may unconsciously be extended from the heaven-given revelation itself to the earth-born interpretations gathered round it. Our inheritance of the faith from apostles, prophets, and martyrs, must make us conservative; but conservatism may degenerate into formality, harden into conventionalism, or breed an unworthy timidity and suspicion of anything new and fresh. The grandeur of religion may possibly lead us to underrate and depreciate other channels of God's communication to mankind, which, albeit they are but rills compared with the great river of Scripture, may yet bring healthy water into the same current, and flow towards the same ocean. In these respects scientific and literary culture has done much to correct our natural exaggerations of truth, and has very largely influenced, and I think largely benefited, the course and the spirit of Biblical study. All this we freely acknowledge, and are grateful to God for it. But we venture to think that if our studies have their characteristic dangers, neither are secular studies devoid of them. The elements of revealed truth which, in the course of Bible study become sources of danger, its grandeur, historical descent and Divine authority supply the very correctives of which the narrowness of physical study, its self-deifying instincts, and its materialistic tendencies stand peculiarly in need. The relation, therefore, which we earnestly desire to establish between secular study and Biblical study is not that of avowed enemies or of jealous neutrals, but of cordial friends, giving mutual help to each other,—allied in the same pursuit of truth—twin streams flowing to the same sea,—two strains of the same song,—two rays of light, one reflected from the world of nature, the other from the world of grace, but meeting in the same sun.

---

* Acts xvii. 23.

† Huxley, *Lay Sermons*, etc., p. 371; speaking of the differences between Metaphysics and Physics.

But for this purpose one condition is essential. All prejudice must be naturally given up. Prejudice is prejudgment without inquiry. That there has been much prejudice on the part of the Church against some branches of science, we most fully admit. We do not care to inquire where the blame lies of producing it: it may be that some men of science have themselves framed a favourite theory into a hideous Frankenstein, and paraded him to frighten the weak, as men frighten boys. But we do not care to debate this; we admit that there has been prejudice on our side, and we wish it to be given up. But, amid the popular outcry, I venture to think that there has been just as much prejudice on the other side. As many hard words—and, luckily, they break no bones—have been, and are, hurled against the theologian by some men of science, as against some men of science by the theologian. The popular language of the platform and the press is full of prejudice. Is it not itself prejudice which charges us with prejudice; which will allow no other name but opinions to truths which are the result of the patient investigation of ages, and the most precious heir-looms of Christianity; and which charges the Clergy all round with ignorant bigotry and fanaticism, because they will not give up these truths at the bidding of the last new-fledged theory in physical science? There is a cant which denounces cant; and that may be prejudice which charges other men with prejudice. Let both sides learn the lesson; and if they sincerely desire to influence one another for good, let them admit the honesty of each other's motives and pay courteous respect to each other's convictions.

How closely on each side special strength and special weakness are coupled together, will best be seen by a rapid reference to three characteristics of modern inquiry. It will be found that science is strong where Biblical study is intellectually weak, and Biblical study strong where science is weak. There can be no despotism on either side, but there may be mutual help and guidance.

We are indebted to scientific culture for the independence and free spirit of inquiry that are the very breath of its life. Of all enemies to religion, intellectual and moral stagnation is far the worst. The most inquisitive spirit of investigation and the most restless curiosity, even though they should run sometimes into self-asserting conceit and impertinent intrusion, are yet far better than torpor, or an exclusive absorption of the human mind in buying and selling, getting and spending. I am one of those who thank God for the age in which I live, with all its faults,—no *laudator temporis acti*, but one who believes that upon the whole the changes of the world are changes for the better, and are surely working out the solution of the great problems of Providence and Grace. Religion has no interest in stagnation, no interest in indifference and materialism, no interest in ignorance. All her interests lie the other way. The Church has known such times, and they have been times of darkness and death, tainting with their corruption the better times which have succeeded. It is true that her revival from them has not been the work of secular science. The movement began from the new life working within herself—the life quickened from the Source and Spring of life, and has rather been communicated by her to others than received from others. But modern culture has reflected, intensified, and in some degree caricatured the activity, and has helped to foster an intense curiosity, which is not satisfied to accept tamely any truth, but sets itself to work out over again even the most primary questions. The influence has reacted on ourselves. We are beginning to go back to such elementary matters as the evidences—principles which we have so long considered as settled, that we have ceased to be familiar with the detailed proofs on which they rest. That incalculable advantages have accrued in many ways to the cause of Divine truth, and that incalculable advantages will continue to flow from it, I have not the slightest doubt. It is without an atom either of reservation or of misgiving that I take down the old books and go back to the old arguments. Let us give to modern culture all the credit it deserves for the impulse it has given us, although it has not been in its heart to do us good; we owe it to Him whose prerogative it is to bring good out of evil. But, on the other side, such a tendency of mind is evidently prone to run into license, and forgetting itself, to overleap the palpable limits of its own power. Speaking, not of this man or of that, but of the whole course of scientific and literary culture, the sacred barriers of revealed truth have done enormous service by checking its extravagance and preventing it from wasting its strength upon the impossible. All may not regard the voice; but the warning issues out of the sacred book to the tide of thought as to the waves of the great sea—"Hitherto shalt thou come and no farther." Nay, it marks its limits in the emphatic title it asserts for the Deity as the living God—the God of Life. Earthly science can deal with dead things, but with life—strange, mysterious, pervading life—it can do nothing. It does not know what life is, and at the present moment I believe I am correct in saying that it has not even got a theory of life, with such baffled and perplexed ignorance does it shrink back trembling before the grand mystery of all mysteries—the mystery of living. Look! I tread beneath my foot, as I walk, the tuft of grass—the commonest object in nature. Yet that familiar tuft of grass marks the line, as with a barrier of adamant, beyond which science cannot come. When it can create a tuft of grass and give it life, then, but never till then, will we place science on the seat of God.

II. We are indebted to science for the cultivation and appreciation of a minute accuracy to which in the previous history of mind there has been no parallel. Its grand triumph is analysis. It decomposes with a most wonderful minuteness. Every day furnishes examples of this delicate accuracy, from mechanical instruments up to the most abstruse investigation. Surfaces are produced so accurately true that they touch nowhere. Instruments so fine, that they weigh, with demonstrable accuracy, the 1-1000th of a grain. Weights so delicate, that they never can be reproduced by copying, but each single set must be elaborately made and computed by itself. It is found that fine gold is perfectly malleable, but that a 1-2000th part of antimony will make it as brittle as glass. The analysis of twenty-five grains of gold has separated them into five different metals, with such extreme accuracy, that only 6-10,000ths of a grain have been lost in the process. Chemical tests detect with certainty the presence of two grains of a foreign substance in a ton of water. There is a metal called vanadium, and the processes necessary to separate it from other elements, and to procure it in a pure state, take a week of consecutive operations in analysis and decomposition; and, in one part of this week, eighty hours of uninterrupted attention. The wonders of the spectrum have enabled man to carry his analysis to other globes beside our own, and to detect some portions, at all events, of their elementary composition. In literature and criticism, and all other inquiry, it is the same. An accuracy, minute, delicate, and sensitive almost beyond the comprehension of ordinary men, is its great characteristic. This accuracy is truly worthy of all praise. It has opened to our admiration secret wonders before unknown. It leads back to great and broad discoveries. But, beyond all dispute, it has an inevitable tendency to narrow the mental vision, destroy width of view, and cramp the very power of perceiving truth into one limited and confined sphere. Just so when we look at some exquisite object in a microscope, we look so closely that all other things are for a while excluded. If we did not draw back from the object-glass, we might be unconscious of the great world around us, and how small a portion the object which entrances our vision forms of the stupendous whole within which it is contained.

Is not this narrowing tendency of scientific investigation illustrated in the fact, that, directly a man finds a theory antagonistic to religion, he cries out at once in a shout of triumph, as if religion were destroyed—as if that one truth had at once overthrown all the complicated branches of evidence which attest the Divine origin of the faith? To the man all the world is embraced in the one thing which constitutes his own speciality; just as if the discovery of a human bone or a flint instrument in a drift were itself sufficient to disprove all history, all prophecy, all miracle, all outward corroboration, all internal proof, and, cutting the ark of the Church loose from her moorings, to send her drifting off into the dark of a shoreless ocean of unbelief. Stand back, my friend, from your microscope, and from that grain of sand look round to the hugeness of creation and the immeasurable majesty of the Deity who fills it.

III. We owe a debt to scientific culture, for the value it has taught us to place on facts, and the rigid proofs necessary for their establishment. Never has a greater service been done to the Church than this. We have learned our lesson, I hope, and, intrenching ourselves amid the impregnable facts of Christian history, have no intention of being driven from them by the feeble artillery of assertion and speculation. We have dutifully learnt our lesson, and mean to abide by it. In the world of matter, facts, proved facts, are the basis of all science. In the world of philosophy, we are urged by a disbeliever in revelation to reject all the speculative systems of ancient and modern times, and to take Comte's positivism in their place, on the express ground that knowledge is useless and false which does not deal with facts. We take it to be true and act upon it. The diligence with which the Bible student accumulates continually his consentient evidences, shows that we obey the rule in our own branch of inquiry. But have we not the right to ask that science should also abide by its own canons? Theories, the truth or the untruth of which can never be proved, because not one particle of evidence can be adduced for them or against them, are surely misnamed when they are called scientific. Science is exact knowledge, and unprovable guesses can form no part of it. Let us return the benefit that physical science has conferred upon us, by firmly demanding that it should obey its own laws and confine itself to arguments based on facts and proved facts. When, for instance, we are asked to believe that all the specific differences of living things have been produced by natural selection, and are yet informed at the same time that not one solitary instance of any beings in the process of transition from one species to another has ever been discovered; when we are told that the asserted truth requires us to believe in countless ages of ages, of which not a single trace remains, in addition to the geologic periods which the facts of the earth's crust attest; we are justified in turning away with a smile, and replying that we deal with facts not with fictions. When we are invited to leave the solid ground of historical and experimental proof, and launch ourselves into the great unknown of imagination in search of truths which baffle our strictest search below, we may not only calmly decline to enter upon such an adventure, but we may boldly denounce its folly, and appeal to facts, in proof that imagination has no wings on which to fly in such a sphere, where atmosphere of reality there is none. Imagination has no productive power, is no creative faculty. In the whole of the human intellect it doubtless has its place, and works in giving vigour and life and strength to thought, but in itself it is wholly dependent on the materials that thought supplies. Take a work of imagination as an instance; we call it a work of fiction. In that work you will find that imagination has not produced a single new idea; has added nothing to the store of our conceptions. It has only grouped together into new combinations, and these sometimes strange and grotesque enough, the experiences of life; it has only rearranged materials with which observation had previously supplied us. Imagination produces nothing, and indeed defines nothing. It is the very opposite of an exact and precise faculty. In its boldest flights it never soars beyond the atmosphere of thought, and only uses the ideas with which the patient, but perhaps unconscious, processes of the pure intellect have already furnished it. Consequently, if we allow imagination to fly back beyond the limits of experimental knowledge, and to conceive the first beginnings of all things, and the mode of their production, the pictures it will draw will be strictly derived from the materials already existing in the mind, and be coloured by its habitual tone of thought and feeling. The picture which the imagination will conjure up to an unbeliever in revelation, will necessarily be totally different from what imagination will conjure up to a believer. Natural knowledge will supply the materials to the one; revealed knowledge will supply the materials to the other; but in neither case will imagination add to them. In the one case the mind begins with the speculative but unproved opinion that man first existed in a state of savage-ism. From this starting-point of an existing theory imagination takes its flight, and toils backward through the prodigious periods of the past—vistas so dim in the far-off distance that it is but a land of shadows. At every step of the journey imagination drops behind out of sight some object of beauty, and out of hearing some sound of melodious life. The road is downward, ever into the darkness. The rich luxuriance of Christian civilization is left behind, with all its gentle and humanizing influence of mutual charity and love and home. Still on imagination passes, reproducing the civilization of heathenism, with all its splendour and voluptuous beauty, with all its intense selfishness and inward corruption—a corpse garlanded with flowers. Still backward, till little by little this civilization becomes coarser and more barbarous, and, instead of the wide-spread joys of the later ages, the imagination can see little but a few huge forms walking over the crushed hearts of other men, like an Egyptian wall-painting—a giant warrior amid a crowd of pigmies. Still back, one sound of life dying away after another till the loneliness and desolation become oppressive, as nought is heard but a sound of pain here and there; back to savage-ism, where man is but the brute. From this point, to what conclusion can imagination possibly come but to one? It leaps into the past, till it stands amid a world of silence and the great darkness of a universe without an inhabitant; and there it sees, cradled in its own solitude, and nursed amid the impenetrable curtains of the abyss—what ?—a primordial atom, silent, senseless, motionless, lifeless, formless—alone. The human eye weeps, and the human heart breaks, beneath the degrading humiliation of such an origin.

Very different indeed is the flight of a believer's fancy. He traces the life of man back too, but it is upward, not downward. His thought likewise passes through periods of sunshine and of shadow, chequered lights of human greatness and human misery; but he sees ever along the course, from first to last, thinking, sentient, conscious, immortal man, awful in the dignity of his soul, and, though fallen, still a son of God, even in decay. Backward, as his imagination wings its flight through human history, one streak of light, connecting together in a flood of glory the first and the last, ever leads him on. Not deeper into the darkness does his flight lead him, but higher into the sunshine, and towards the light unapproachable around the throne of God. There he finds no dull insensate monad; but a living being with perfect attributes, in all the beauty of a newly created manhood, fresh from the Creator's hands, and without a spot as yet to sully the full image and similitude of God. And behind, as with one more effort imagination springs back to the beginning, it falls and worships, for it finds, not a solitude, but a Deity—love, light, life, all in one, primal Fount of being, self-existing Spring of all things; "Alpha and Omega;" beginning, middle, and end; "which was, and is, and is to come, the Almighty."

I suppose that the unbeliever is satisfied with the picture of his imagination. We, for our part, are content with the picture of our faith, and have neither wish nor intention to exchange.

ADDRESS.

The Rev. Professor Rawlinson, read the following :—

There is always a difficulty in recalling with any distinctness, and vividly reproducing to ourselves, a state of feeling which has passed away. As the waves that beat upon a sandy shore obliterate the marks of the preceding waves, so the thought-current of to-day throws into oblivion the thought-current of yesterday, and renders our recollection of it dim and uncertain, hazy, vague, and indefinite. It is, however, essential to the subject which I have undertaken to-day, that we should form something like an estimate of the attitude in which literary research and criticism stood towards Faith, at a time not really very remote from the present, but which—such is the rapid rate whereat thought progresses at the present day—may seem remote to most of us. It was, I think, about five-and-thirty years ago that scepticism reached its acme, that the triumph of un-Faith over Faith seemed most imminent, and that literature and criticism stood towards Christianity in the most unfavourable attitude. The reaction which it has been our privilege to witness dates from about the year 1835. At that time the general conviction in Germany seems to have been, that it was impossible to maintain the historical character of the writings of either the Old or the New Testament,—that the Books were rarely written by the authors whereto they were ascribed, or within some centuries of the time commonly assigned to them,—that they contained at best a basis of fact, overlaid by a huge accretion of fable,—and that consequently it was impossible to maintain the old kind of religious belief, or, indeed, any belief at all, except one of a novel and highly questionable character. A series of sceptical writers, Semler, Eichhorn, Corrodi, Herder, Bauer, Vater, Bertholdt, De Wette, Winer, Von Leugerke, Ewald, Strauss, had attacked almost every book of Scripture in turn, and had seemed to carry all before them. They proclaimed everywhere, with a flourish of trumpets, their own victories, and announced to the world with confidence that the old faith was fallen. Few and far between were the theologians that with weak voice disputed their conclusions, and strove to keep faith alive among their countrymen. When something like an orthodox School began to appear, between 1830 and 1840, we find them complaining and lamenting that they have no standing ground; that belief in the historical truth of the Scripture narrative is gone; and that it is doubtful whether any efforts can restore it. (Keil's Josua Vorwort, p. 2). The general impression at that time produced by the Rationalistic writers seems to have been, that the Scriptural narratives were not to be regarded as histories,—that moral reformers, taking certain traditions of little or no value as their basis, had from time to time striven to impress certain moral and religious truths upon the world by works cast in a narrative form, but that that form was in the main artistic,—that it was assumed to suit the Oriental mind, the writers themselves not believing in their facts, or having any care or value for them, excepting as convenient vehicles through which to instil into the minds of their readers moral truths.

And the tone of thought which was almost universal in Germany was (as usual) after a while reflected among ourselves, and threatened to become predominant. German Theology was more and more studied as time went on, partly in the original, partly in translations; and the Mythical theory (as I may call it) which the Germans had put forward, obtained constantly more and more acceptance. Such a view of the Scriptures harmonized well with the dreamy mysticism of the Hegelian philosophy, then first becoming popular among us by the teaching of one of the ablest of its disciples.

"When the night is at the darkest, it draws towards dawn." By God's Providence, about the time when the mythical theory was growing popular in this country, and threatening to become the general belief of theological students, a new light broke upon us from the East, adapted effectually to dispel the illusion that was creeping over our souls. Patient study of the Hieroglyphics, by means of the clue which the genius of Champollion and Young had furnished, unlocked to us the stores of ancient Egyptian literature. Examination of the mounds of Mesopotamia gave us back, not only the pictured forms of the Assyrians and Babylonians, but a great portion of their history. More recently, research in Palestine has been rewarded by the discovery of a most valuable Moabitic document. By these and similar means we have obtained a knowledge of the ancient world—of the world coeval with the Jewish history recorded in the Old Testament—different altogether in kind from that which we possessed before. We have come to know intimately the Egypt of the Pharaohs, the Assyria of Tiglath-Pileser and Sennacherib, the Babylon of Nebuchadnezzar,—we have come to have a knowledge of these countries, at those distant times, not very much inferior to that which we possess of Greece and Rome in their most flourishing periods. And it results from our knowledge that we find, not only from time to time direct confirmation of the truth of the Old Testament history, but *throughout* that far more subtle and far more important agreement, which consists in harmony with respect to such matters as manners and customs, geography, language, ethnic, and personal names, and the like,—a harmony which to every enlightened student of history is proof positive of the authentic historical character of the documents between which it is found subsisting. As far back as the year 1840, Hengstenberg showed in his work, "Œgypten und Mose," that the agreement between the Pentateuch and the earliest Egyptian records was of the closest kind; that it included not only historical harmony, but agreement with respect to geography, manners, customs, productions, and language. Increased acquaintance with the subject has only served to multiply the points of accord; and the progress of Egyptology is continually bringing out into a clearer light the wonderful accuracy of the Mosaic narrative in all that bears on the interesting country which is the scene of the history in much of Genesis and Exodus. The forthcoming volume of the "Biblical Commentary" will, I have reason to believe, exhibit this harmony in a very striking way, carrying out the argument of Hengstenberg by reference to the entire course of recent Egyptian discovery up to its latest triumphs.

No work similar to Hengstenberg's has appeared in connection with Assyrian and Babylonian research; but the many popular books in which the Mesopotamian discoveries have been set forth, and the appeals to the eye which have been made by the bas-reliefs in our great national museum, have produced, in a less systematic way, nearly the same result as Hengstenberg's volume, convincing almost all who were willing to be convinced that the later narrative of the Old Testament, like the earlier, deals with facts and realities, not with shadows and fables. The books of Kings, Chronicles, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel, are found to present the same sort of close harmony and agreement with the Babylonian and Assyrian remains that the Pentateuch exhibits in respect of those of Egypt. Not only names of kings, and their great deeds, expeditions, transplantations, and the like, are harmoniously represented in the two literatures; but in hundreds of minute points, geographic, etymologic, ethologic, the same harmony obtains. As I ventured to assert some years ago,—"The history of this period, as delivered to us in the sacred writers, stands firm against all the assaults made upon it; and the more light that is thrown by research and discovery upon the times and countries with which it deals, the more apparent becomes its authentic and matter-of-fact character. Instead of ranging parallel with the mythic traditions of Greece and Rome, with which some have compared it, it stands, *at the least*, on a par with the ancient histories of Egypt, Babylon, Phœnicia, and Assyria, which, like it, were recorded from a remote antiquity by national historiographers. Sound criticism finds in these sacred writings of the Jews documents belonging to the times of which they profess to treat, and on a calm investigation classes them, not with romantic poems or mythological fables, but with the sober narratives of those other ancient writers who have sought to hand down to posterity a true account of the facts which their eyes have witnessed." ("Bampton Lectures," p. 191.)

It is interesting and consolatory to find that there is scarcely a point of this ancient history, however obscure, that may not receive sudden confirmation, illustration, and real additional light from contemporary documents, which may at any moment be drawn forth from obscurity, and brought before us. A year ago one would have said that there was no part of the sacred narrative less likely to obtain this sort of confirmation than the relations of the Israelites with Moab in the ninth century before our era. There had at that time been no discovery of any inscribed monument in Western Asia, reaching within several centuries of that date, that was not either Egyptian or Assyrian: and it was most improbable that either Egyptian or Assyrian monarch would take notice of so small a matter as a struggle between two such petty kingdoms upon his borders. The matter could naturally only be noticed by the Israelites or the Moabites themselves; and there was not the slightest reason to suspect that either people had been in the habit of recording its history on any permanent material. Last spring, however, news reached England of the discovery of the now famous "Moabite Stone;" and the inscription on this monument has proved to be the work of the very "Mesha, king of Moab," who, as related in the second Book of Kings (ch. iii.), rebelled against Ahab, and warred with Jehoram and Jehoshaphat. The king traces the struggle between the two nations, from the time of Omri to that of his grandson (probably Ahaziah), and relates how he shook off the Israelite yoke, as recorded in Kings (2 Kings i. 1), and made himself an independent monarch. His inscription shows us Chemosh as the national god of the Moabites, exactly as he is represented to us in Scripture; and in its geographical details is in the fullest harmony with the sacred writers. Out of about twenty Moabite towns known to us from the Bible, no fewer than twelve are mentioned on the stone,—one under the two forms known to us from the Jewish records of Baal-Meon, and Beth-Baal-Meon. If on a point of such obscurity and of such comparatively minor importance as this, research and exploration can procure for us so much illustration and confirmation of our sacred books, it is difficult to say what point may not receive similar corroboration, if the investigations but lately begun in Palestine and the adjacent countries are conducted (as we trust they will be) with vigour and perseverance.

Another line of research which has helped much to dispel the notion of the Biblical narratives being myths—products of the imagination—is that pursued by travellers of learning and ability, who have, Bible in hand, traversed the countries which are the scenes of the events narrated. Such works as those of Robinson, Williams, Dean Stanley, Tristram, and others, tending as they have done to show the minute accuracy of the sacred historians in all that relates to localities and their accessories, have been of much service in counteracting the effects of the mythical school, and in deepening the impression otherwise produced of the matter-of-fact character of the Bible history. A large amount of useful labour of this kind is embodied in our recent "Biblical Dictionaries"—works of great and varied learning, and of which English Theology may well be proud—since no works of the same kind, that can bear comparison with them, have been produced upon the continent.

The result of all this study and labour, and of other influences which time has not permitted me to mention, has been (I think) to convince most men that the Mythical theory is untenable, and to cause them to receive as authentic history the greater part, at any rate, of the Biblical narrative. The sceptical school at the present time, driven from the position which it had taken up by the force of the argument derived from recent research, has shifted its ground and occupied a new position. Its aim now is to effect a separation between different portions of the sacred narrative, and while accepting the whole of the ordinary civil and military history as true, to reject only the supernatural element. It is observed that the newly-discovered records, which confirm the history generally, furnish no confirmation of the miracles. Nebuchadnezzar does not tell us that, according to the prophecy of Daniel, he was smitten with a mysterious madness. Sennacherib does not relate that in one night his whole army was destroyed silently. It is therefore argued that we may effect a severance between the natural and the supernatural in our

Books, and, while allowing the one, entirely reject the other. But this severance is exactly what the Books themselves do not allow. In Herodotus and Livy we may cut out the prodigies and leave the main narrative untouched, since it is in no way dependent on them. In the Pentateuch, in Kings, in Daniel, we cannot do so—the two are inseparably intertwined—the supernatural element is indeed the essence and basis of the whole. But if this is the case, and if from extraneous sources we prove the truth of a part of the facts, have we not done something towards sustaining the truth of the remainder? Is it likely that writers would be minutely exact with regard to every little geographic or ethologic detail, yet invent the plagues of Egypt, the pillar of the cloud, the fall of fire from heaven on the altar of Jehovah on Carmel, or the appearance of the handwriting upon the palace wall at Babylon? To discredit the miraculous portions of the Scripture narrative, the sceptical writers almost always either assume, or attempt to prove, that the Books were composed long after the time of the events narrated in them: the Pentateuch, during the Captivity—Kings and Chronicles, about the time of Alexander—Daniel, in the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes. The miracles may then be traditional accounts, exaggerated by passing from hand to hand, of events in the far distant past in which there was nothing really supernatural. The tendency of recent research is to upset this theory by showing that the writers had such an exact and accurate knowledge of the history, the manners, and the political geography of the times about which they wrote, as marks them for contemporaries—that the Pentateuch must have been written by Moses or one of his companions—that Kings and Chronicles are substantially State-records drawn up in the reigns of the monarchs treated of—that Daniel is the work of one who lived under Nebuchadnezzar and Cyrus. As the minute accuracy which we find in these books is altogether alien to the spirit of mythical compositions, so likewise is it unlike anything that we find in histories written long after the time of the events by persons possessing only a traditional knowledge of the subjects of their narratives.

The time at my disposal is drawing to a close; and I feel that I have very inadequately treated even that portion of the large subject placed before me by your Committee, whereto I have especially addressed myself. I would willingly have said a few words on other portions of the subject—as on the light that historical research has thrown on the authenticity of the *New* Testament narrative, and on the general effect of the Textual Criticism which has been carried to such an extent in our day. But I feel that these important branches of the inquiry cannot be fitly entered upon at the close of a paper. I trust that they will be treated by those who will follow me. I may, however, perhaps be allowed, before sitting down, to express my conviction that, as with the Old so with the New Testament, the tendency of recent research has been to establish the authentic character of the narrative. The writings of Olshausen and Döllinger in Germany; of Alford, Conybeare, Wordsworth, Howson, Ellicott, among ourselves, have (I think), established beyond reasonable doubt, the fact, that the historical books of the New Testament are works of the first century, written by actors in the scenes described in them, authentic certainly, and in all probability genuine. And upon the other point to which I have alluded, I may briefly say, that Textual Criticism, while it has shown a certain amount of interpolations into the original documents, and (in the Old Testament) more corruption, especially of names and numbers, than had been suspected to exist previously, has left the doctrines of our faith untouched, and only modified in a very few points the previously accepted narrative. The entire result of the searching criticism which our Sacred Books have undergone seems to be that the purity of their text, in every essential respect, is made evident; that their genuineness, when they bear the name of an author, is, if not proved, at any rate shown to be in the highest degree probable; and that the authenticity of the narrative which they set before us is thoroughly and completely established. The contradictions and inconsistencies which the Rationalistic critics thought that they discovered between different portions of the narrative, or between the narrative and profane history, have been found, on careful examination, for the most part either to disappear wholly, or to resolve themselves into textual errors, such as are to be found in all compositions of high antiquity. If any of these remain, they are, by the solution of so many others, reduced to the rank of mere difficulties—difficulties of which we may not as yet have found the right explanation, but of which we need not doubt that an explanation is possible. Ὁ *χρόνος εὑρετής*. Time, which has removed so many stumbling-blocks from our path, may at last remove these also; or they may remain obscure, trials to our faith, till the day comes when we no longer "see through a glass darkly," but "know as we are known," and "see face to face."

DISCUSSION.

Dr. Evans.

My Lord,—I am wishful to impress upon this audience the effect, or what I believe to be the effect, of the oneness of the law of God and the Gospel of Christ. I am disposed to declare that all God's physical and moral laws are as incumbent upon Christian people as the Gospel itself, because there is no one moral or physical law of God that can be violated without entailing the consequences incidental to the violation of law. Philosophy and religion will be one great truth when we perfectly understand all the revelations of God to man, from Adam to Noah, from Noah to Abraham, from Abraham to Moses, and from Moses to Jesus Christ, and the Lord Himself at His second coming. For all these are in the line of faith. It is through them that the revelations of God have been made known to man, in unison with those revelations which have been made manifest through nature. Not one of them contradicts nature, but all of them are in perfect harmony with the revelations of nature to mankind. Health was revealed in the laws of God. Life was revealed in the manifestation of Jesus Christ. That did not destroy health but added to health life ("Question, question"). Physical Science and Biblical Criticism I believe to be the question; and I think I have as fairly entered into that question as any speaker from this platform. ("Oh, oh!"). At least I will endeavour to do so, if I have not.

[Expressions of disapproval continued, and, in consequence, Dr. Evans abruptly resumed his seat.]

The Rev. George Williams.

My Lord,—Many of us listened with great interest on Tuesday morning to the sermon of the Lord Bishop of Salisbury, in which he advocated the historic method for the vindication of revelation against modern objections, rather than the old method which we used to speak of, and now familiarly understand, as that of "Evidences." All whom I have heard express any opinion on that sermon, show that they felt the great value of it; and if the argument of the Bishop in that discourse was correct, then, I think, we must all feel that every fresh link in the historic chain connected with Holy Scripture is of very great value and importance. I should be glad to add one or two links to that chain; but I want first of all to say a few words in order to re-echo and to emphasize one observation made by Mr. Titcomb in his opening paper, when, in speaking especially of the enlarged investigations and the increased cultivation of physical science, he told us that he approached the subject without any feeling of panic. I think it is very important indeed to dwell a little upon that. We all remember that a very serious attack as it at first seemed, upon Revelation—at any rate, on that portion of the books of Revelation contained in the Pentateuch—was unhappily made a few years ago by a Bishop of our Church. That attack seemed, to the unlearned, to be very formidable indeed,—to those who were not aware of the nature of such objections, and were ignorant of the fact that most of them were of very ancient date. I say those statements appeared formidable, but I mean only the principal statements; for I think anybody must have seen that the great majority of the arguments were such as might be expected of a pettifogging lawyer, who held a brief against Moses and the prophets, rather than of a deep, a serious, and a religious divine. To the unlearned those arguments appeared formidable; but to the learned it was far otherwise; for they could apply to them the trite saying, that "what was new was not true, and what was true was not new." Everything of weight in those objections had been stated before, and probably better stated than in the books to which I am alluding; but everything that was new, or nearly all that was new, was very weak.

Those who had studied St. Augustine's writings knew that these objections to the narrative contained in the Mosaic books of the Old Testament had been urged by Faustus with an ability that certainly was not equalled in Bishop Colenso's work, and answered with an amount of learning at any rate equal to that possessed by any of our modern divines. I want, therefore, to emphasize what Mr. Titcomb urged, as to our not being panic-struck at such things. For the future, I say, let the faithful—the unlearned faithful—of the Church regard such attacks upon revelation with indifference, so far as they can, except for the sake of those who advance and who lead these attacks. Let them possess their souls in peace, and be quite certain that these objections do admit of a valid answer, even if they themselves should not know what the answer is. Now, I want to tell you what has followed this attack,—I won't say as its result,—for I think it is calculated to show how utterly that attack has failed, formidable as it appeared, and how completely those objections have been disposed of.

You have all recently heard of the Sinai survey. That survey was conducted by the Ordnance Department—which has its head-quarters in this town—and carried out under the direction of Major-general Sir Henry James, the Director-General of the Ordnance Survey, by properly qualified officers and men connected with the department. You know that the object of that expedition was to investigate the region of Sinai - the mountain of the law—to obtain an accurate survey of the whole of the district around Serbal and Sinai—the rival claimants to the honour -and to explore all the country lying about and between those mountains, with especial reference to the Exodus.

This exploration, it must be remembered, was not undertaken to prove the truth of the Scripture narrative, in answer to any objections; but the truth of the narrative was taken for granted; and the object with which this scientific expedition was sent out was simply this—to enable us better to understand that which was already admitted as a true narrative.

The result of that Sinai survey—as you will see from the interesting series of photographs to be exhibited at the Hartley Institution to-morrow evening -is to confirm to the letter the historical truth of Holy Scripture. There you will see that the most accurate and the most minute details of all the physical features of that region have been brought together; and although it is quite true that we must give up the theory of Mr. Charles Foster—who held that the Sinaitic inscriptions were contemporaneous records of the Exodus—we shall have something that will quite compensate for that loss; and I trust we shall have, besides, the means of verifying all the stations of the Children of Israel, and all the circumstances of their encampment in and about Mount Sinai; while, in conjunction with this, you will find that the geographical features of that country, as now explored, entirely agree with the historical notices we have in the Book of Exodus.

I can only just refer, in conclusion, to one historical episode in the books of the Old Testament, which I have never seen alluded to. We were quite lately reading, in the usual course of Sunday lessons, that most interesting account of the Rechabites, in the Book of the Prophet Jeremiah. We find the Jehonadab there mentioned, alluded to in connection with Jehu, the son of Nimshi; and we can trace the Rechabites back to Hemath, the patriarch of the Kenites, who were descended from Hobab, the father-in-law of Moses. These Rechabites received from God, through His prophet Jeremiah, a promise of perpetual existence:—"Jonadab, the son of Rechab, shall not want a man to stand before me for ever." Now, it is a most interesting and important fact, that these Rechabites are in existence at the present day—existing as a separate tribe among the Arabs of the Hedjaz—still cherishing the traditions of their fathers—tracing back their history to that notice in the Old Testament, and pointing to that chapter in the Book of the prophet Jeremiah as accounting for their continued and separate existence.

Many of you have been doubtless induced to take an interest in the Rechabites from the notices of them in Mr. Plumptre's little volume of poems; and you will be very glad, I have no doubt, to trace out the evidence of the fact which I have stated, and which I shall hope shortly to take an opportunity of placing before the public.

The Rev. Canon KINGSLEY.

MY LORD,—I beg in a very few words to congratulate you and this meeting on the tone of the papers which I have heard read, bearing upon the question of modern physical science. It was a very great pleasure to me to observe such evidences of the change which has passed over the minds of my Clerical brethren during the last thirty years or so. We will let byegones be byegones. We will let the dead bury their dead; but I am very well aware that thirty years ago we should have heard a very different tone to that which, thank God, we hear now. I believe that the good work—for I call it a good work—will grow; and that more and more the Clergy of the Church of England will deserve the very high compliment which my friend, Professor Tyndall, paid them at the meeting of the British Association, the other day, which I was very happy to hear quoted by one of the preceding speakers. I am one of those who from youth, and before I became a priest of the Church of England, or a deacon either, held, and hold still, with intensity, the belief that God's revelation in the Bible and God's revelation in the physical universe will ultimately be found to coincide; that they cannot contradict each other; and that if they seem to contradict each other, it is simply on account of our ignorance and misunderstanding of one or the other—or it may be of both. And, therefore, I entreat any of my Clerical brethren who may still have their doubts upon this point to have patience—patience with men of science; and to get patience by having faith in God. Impatience with science proceeds, I think, not from too much faith in Christianity, and in that holy Catholic Church to which we belong, but from too little faith in them. If we believe firmly that the Church does speak with the voice of the Lord Jesus Christ; and if we do firmly believe that that same Lord Jesus Christ is the Word of God by whom all things were made and without whom there was nothing made that was made, who worketh hitherto as His Father works, and upholdeth all things still by the word of His power, then we shall allow science, I will not say, to go her way, but we shall wish her joy upon her way; we shall help her on in her way; we shall believe that our business as Clergymen of the Church of England is to make her way smooth and plain before her, and get an opening for her into our people's hearts to the best of our power. I think that the Clergy of the Church of England have not been behind-hand in this work. Some of the most admirable books on popular science which the world has ever seen, have been and are now being written by Clergymen of the Church of England; and I trust that this work will go on, and that the Clergy of our Church will show themselves—as I believe they have been in the long run ever since the Reformation—the most progressive and the most liberal-minded Clergy in the whole of Christendom. That has long been my opinion; and I thank God I belong to a Church which numbers in its ranks such philosophers as Berkeley, Cudworth, Butler, Paley, Whewell, and many another world-wide name. I foresee—or fancy that I foresee—an epoch which has not yet arrived—but which is, it seems to me, just about to arrive, when there will be a great revolution in the habits of philosophical thought throughout Europe, and certainly in England—when the Nominalistic view of philosophy having done all that it can do, and as it were run to seed for a time—as it seems to me to be doing now both in England and in Germany—shall be succeeded again by what we call a more Realistic philosophy; and that, as I trust, there will spring up in England, which is the home of Natural Theology, a school of natural theologians, who, taking up the neglected, I had almost said the extinct, science of natural theology where Bacon and Berkeley and Paley and Whewell left it, and reviewing the connection between God and His universe by the increased light which modern physical science has given us, will show not only a parallelism, but a perfect sympathy, a perfect union between natural and revealed religion, such as the world has never yet seen. And I say this without the slightest fear or the slightest shrinking from any of those advanced theories, of the truth or the falsehood of which it is not for me to speak; and in respect to which all I can say is—that if they do not astonish me, and if they do not terrify me, it is because I feel that if they be true, God is even more wise and wonderful and great, than I was ever taught to believe Him to be; and that conviction will only receive fresh strength, if it be true that He produces the wonderful effects which we see around us in the material universe by means infinitely more simple than we, with our finite intellects, could possibly have conceived. I wish to say no more. I only entreat you to have faith in God: and to have patience with those men who—though you may differ from them now, and they may differ from you—are endeavouring to work out the laws of God as revealed in the facts of the universe just (I believe) as faithfully, just (I believe) as honestly, and just (I believe) as patiently, as you and I are trying to do our own work in our own station of life.

The Rev. W. E. Littlewood, M.A., Vicar of Ironville, Derbyshire.

My Lord Bishop,—Very little has been said in the course of this discussion about the *effect* of the culture of physical science and literature. We have heard very much about the results of that increased culture, but I was longing during the reading of some of the papers—able and most instructive as they were—to hear something more about the effects of the advances in physical science, and so on, upon a class in which I am very much interested, with which I have some acquaintance, and which is rapidly becoming one of the most powerful classes in this country—I mean the working class. It is idle for us to suppose that persons have not made use of the arguments which my brethren who have preceded me have so ably controverted, to unsettle and to sap the faith of the labouring classes of this country: and therefore I want, if I may be allowed, just to introduce this subject, in the hope that some one more able and more accustomed to such a place as this, may go on with the work. I also want to say a few words—first of all, about the position of the working classes with respect to physical science; and secondly, I want to say a few words, in a very humble manner, of advice to my brother clergymen who have semi-infidel populations to deal with. First of all, I don't believe there is very much professed scepticism among the working men. Certain newspapers, it is true, a little while ago, when they had not got the war and baby-murders to talk about, and when the "casual" business was got over, found out that there was a certain

Hall of Science somewhere down in Finsbury, and that there was an infidel lecturer there attracting large multitudes to hear him. Twenty years ago the same thing was going on. Twenty years ago, at least, I stood, not in that very Hall of Science, but in one near to it, and although I was then a young man fresh from college, I endeavoured to say a few words, at the close of the infidel lecture which I then heard, for the cause of Christ my master. I believe that open infidelity, whether in London or in other large towns, has not that hold upon the populace which it is supposed to have, and I will adduce just two points in regard to this assertion. I know the town of Halifax, which has a population of somewhere about 70,000, and that is pre-eminently a working-class population. There is only one bookshop in that town (to my knowledge) where infidel publications can find a sale. I work at this moment among a population composed of the working class, numbering something like 3000; and although that population is surrounded by others of a similar class, I am told that there is no demand whatever for infidel publications among these people. Now I say these are encouraging facts; but while they are encouraging, we cannot conceal from ourselves that there is a certain uneasiness—that the man who swaggers out of the public-house late at night, having left the earnings there which he should have taken to his wife and family, is somewhat consoled when he is taught by persons of his own class that there are certain flaws in the Book of Genesis, and that some of the genealogies of Scripture are not all right. Besides which, we cannot doubt that there is to a certain extent an infidel propaganda in London. Let me say, then, to my clerical brethren—if I may be permitted to advise others abler than myself, but with less assurance—that if they have to deal with populations of that kind, I would not advise them openly to preach controversial sermons, but I would advise them to be putting constantly that great question—Where does life come from? That is a question which can be put under a great variety of forms, and under whatever form it is put it is unanswerable except by that one answer which is given us in the opening of God's Word, that "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." I am very pleased to say that one of the high-priests of the sect of the Sadducees at the present time is coming round to the conclusion that the creation must have been pretty much as it is there stated to be. I would further advise my clerical brethren, if they have difficulties in their parish requiring special assistance, or have need of controversial lectures, to employ thoroughly experienced men. There is a society called "The Christian Evidence Society." I believe some of the bishops of our Church are its promoters, if not members of its council—and they will give you the proper persons to meet the working classes. The working man is not always nor often met by such arguments as have been addressed to us to-day. He is met by *ad captandum* arguments, which, although we may despise them, have a great effect upon him; and the more solid and weighty arguments to combat these are brought forward by the lecturers of the Christian Evidence Society. Then I would further recommend to my clerical brethren that, after all, the best thing to do is to live before your people as if you believed it yourselves. In doing this we are only following humbly in the footsteps of our blessed Master, who said—"The works that I do they testify of me;" and if we live, in humble dependence upon God,. a holy Christ-like life, depend upon it we shall have a very considerable, though I grant you not a whole, reply to the infidel lecturer when he comes. And I think we shall do much better if we do this than if we are quarreling about High Church and Low Church with all their attendant controversies. I look upon physical science, and so on, as producing at least this effect in the Church of this day: that, like the fortifications of Paris, if it keeps the enemy out, it draws the people closer together and makes them more of one heart and one mind. I am sure the task which you, my lord, had this morning was a very difficult one. It reminded me very much of the job which an Irish peasant had when he took two pigs to market together. After many unavailing efforts, the plan he hit upon was this. Despairing almost entirely of his two animals, which were determined to go opposite ways, he tied the leg of one to the leg of the other. Now, my lord, there was, I need scarcely say, much remonstrance, but there was no progress. And then

I felt—not that I would at all compare your lordship's action to this—that if we are tied too much together there will not be that progression which we need. Now we want to progress. I must say myself that there is a great chasm between us, the evangelical, and the other party in the Church. I am willing to meet them; but I think we shall do best by working heartily in our respective spheres; and if we are fraternising now and can meet upon such occasions to shake hands with each other, then, I think, we shall continue more at peace together by getting back as soon as possible to our work.

The PRESIDENT, in allusion to a remark made by the last speaker, here good-humouredly said, that he must entirely deny, both for himself and all his brethren, there being any approach to *porcine* action on their part,—and having done so, he would call on the next speaker.

Archdeacon FREEMAN.

I STAND before you this afternoon, as I did this morning, as a very old-fashioned sort of believer. For one thing, I really believe there was such a man as Adam. (laughter.) I do really, though Mr. Vance Smith says there was not. And more than that, I also believe that the world received its present form, and that the living creatures were placed upon it, in six literal days. If we attempt to interpret those days as so many periods of enormous length, we get into difficulties, as I shall show you presently. I hold, indeed, as firmly as any one, that Genesis recognises an enormous, and may be illimitable, creational period, previous to the six days' work. But Genesis also teaches us that that period was brought to a close by a catastrophe, a penal catastrophe, which destroyed every living creature, and made the earth to be "without form and void," and "darkness to be upon the face" of the submerging "deep." From the use of these terms by the prophet Jeremiah, we know that "without form and void," means "ruined and rendered desolate of all life there previously existing." [The reference is to Jeremiah iv. 23-26. "I beheld the earth, and lo, it was without form and void (or ruined and desolate), and the heavens, and they had no light; I beheld, and lo, there was no man, and all the birds of the heavens were fled. The fruitful place was a wilderness, and all the cities thereof were broken down at the presence of the Lord, and by His fierce anger."] And the same passage implies that such destruction was probably penal, caused by some unfitness in what was destroyed. And such unfitness there would be, if, as there is good reason for conceiving, the agency of the evil one had been at work to mar the previous creation. Now what do geology and astronomical science say to this? Among the more recently established facts of geology, is that of one or more glacial periods, and vast cataclysms, having overwhelmed, towards the close of the geological period, immense regions of the globe. Nor can it be proved that there was not a universal catastrophe of this kind, blotting out all life, and submerging the entire earth. Sir William Herschel conjectures, with much probability (see papers in "Good Words"), that the glacial catastrophes might be caused by an excessive enlargement of spots upon the sun. Here then we have geology and Genesis harmonizing, or perfectly reconcileable with each other. The long period of creational activity, in which all the great types of being were successively produced, may well have been thus brought to a close. And the hideous and cruel character of many of the fossil creatures quite falls in with the supposition that this earlier work had been marred by the intervention of the evil one, which called down a penal destruction. Then followed the six days' reparation of heavens and earth, and the creation of a new race of animals after the former types. And there is one question which it seems impossible to answer, on the supposition that the days were periods of thousands of years. How, in that case, could every beast of the field and bird of the air be brought to Adam to receive names? Manifestly it was a freshly created race that was thus brought to him. It has been often said, again, that theologians have had to recede from positions unwarily taken up by them. But has not science had her experiences of this sort too? Not long ago a human jaw was found in the valley of the Somme, but, unluckily, in a stratum where there was nothing to eat! It was afterwards found to be made of plaster of Paris. In the same valley such a vast number of flint implements were found, as could only be accounted for by supposing that some 400,000 carpenters had lived there, and had all lost their axe-heads. So, again, some geologists demand endless millions of years for their theories. But it has been ascertained that the secular retardation of the earth, *i.e.* the diminution of its speed, has amounted to about five or six seconds in the last 5,000 years. Had it then been created more than a certain number of millions of years, it would by this time be standing still. But, as it does not stand still, there must be some mistake. But science again often confirms, in the most unexpected way, the declarations of Scripture. Thus, Sir W. Thomson has shown that in that perpetual conversion of force into heat, and *vice versâ*, which is going on in nature, the tendency is, in the lapse of ages, that all existing force should be changed into heat, a statement parallel to the Scripture account, that at the last "the elements shall melt with fervent heat." Another instance is that of the mysterious and wonderful germs, whose vitality has of late been so ably maintained by Professor Huxley. The experiments of M. Pasteur, the celebrated French chemist, show that these creatures are the means by which corruption is wrought in vegetable and animal substances. Now nothing, as he has shown, is capable of destroying these creatures, short of a heat of 300° Fahrenheit, a heat unknown to nature, except in the electric flash. Here, too, "fervent heat" is indicated as the only possible destroyer of the world; and also that "the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death." As to the general question: as two waves of water, proceeding from opposite points, produce a calm at their meeting, so, it is found, that two opposing waves of light produce darkness. So is it when science and Scripture are set in opposition to each other: their two lights result, to our view, in darkness. But this darkness is not essential or real; it will one day be light.

The Rev. Frederick Arnold, Curate of the Chapel of Ease, Worthing.

The discussion, my lord, has travelled over the whole subject,—both on the literary side and on the scientific side. I shall venture very briefly to bring forward a few considerations respecting certain matters of science that have occurred to my own mind of late, especially in relation to the meeting of the British Association at Liverpool. I confess that I think I may claim some portion of sympathy from many here; for in reading the Liverpool speeches I certainly felt myself to be altogether among the outsiders. It is impossible to argue with the master of three hundred legions, and equally impossible for any one to argue on their own ground with such distinguished men of science as Professor Tyndall or Professor Huxley. I think if there is one feeling predominant in the minds of this vast assemblage, it is that of the absolute reverence which we owe to the revelations of science, and the great anxiety we all have that the feud between religion and science should be set at rest by importing more of the spirit of science into religion, and more also of the spirit of religion into science. It is impossible that we should not fully accept anything that comes to us as proved by evidence and by the logical deductions of reason. But reason is one thing, and scientific imagination is another thing. While I bow to the science of these gentlemen, I am not bound to accept their imagination as science. There is a danger, too, that while we are anxious to give unto science the things that are of science, we may in some slight degree deny to faith the things that are of faith; and thus, through our toleration and our love of truth, we may be sacrificing some of those principles that guide our intelligent belief in Holy Scripture. Now there are a few principles perfectly clear, to which if we are true, it seems to me that we may look, altogether unperturbed, upon that great stir in the mind of man which is caused by the progress of physical science. When we find such a man as Professor Balfour saying that he must shrink from the speculations of science; and when we find such a man as Sir William Thomson saying that he cannot give to geology all the term of years which it demands, we are entitled to say,—You must prove, and rigidly prove, your assertions before we are prepared to surrender that upon which we have relied as the result of long and constant teaching. It seems to me that there are just three principles, relying upon which we need not fear to approach any matter of controversy. The first of these principles is,—that in all this controversy the question really at issue is not the question of creation, but the question of development. Professor Tyndall has stated that there was, he considered, a time when our earth had been detached from a fiery nebula. We ask—Where was that fiery nebula in the first place? We have, again, the doctrine of Darwinism: that the world came from one, or, it might be, from two or three primordial germs having life. But then comes the question—Whence came these primordial germs? Professor Huxley tells us that if he could go back to a point beyond the commencement of geological time, he expects that he could find matter living evolved from matter not living. Then we ask—From whence came that not-living matter? And we go beyond that and say—Whence came the conditions under which all life must exist? Whence came time? Whence came space? Who laid those bottomless foundations, and spread abroad those illimitable limits? Thus we go back, step by step, until we come to the great problem of absolute creation: all the theories we hear only touch upon the degrees of development. Professor Huxley has given us his views of man at full length in various publications. What are his views on the growth and history of man? He has stated in one of his works that there was less difference between a monkey and a man than between one man and another; and in his last speech he expresses his belief that the first commencement of organic life was doubtless something resembling the present fungi of the earth. And so his theory may be summed up by saying, that before he came to his present condition man was first a mushroom and afterwards a monkey. Now, in that theory I know not where we can find any place for the words that "God created man in His own image: in the image of God created He him." And one truth that we must hold fast is this—that, however God may, in condescension to the weakness of His creatures, veil His operations under language capable of being understood by their faculties, there is still an essential verity, substance, and truth, in the declaration which He has made respecting the genesis of things. Then, if we accept this one principle, that human philosophy cannot solve the question, but can only continue shifting the question, stage after stage, backwards—teaching that man has gone through various processes of development,—but coming at length to a point where human faculty is powerless to pass judgment, because it fails to comprehend—we have established this necessary limitation of human power, and we have the doctrine, that man is unable to solve this question, for which he is altogether inadequate by the conditions of his being. Then, another principle is, that there is a world of mind beyond the world of matter. Mind is separated by the whole diameter of being from matter. You cannot construct a workman out of a workman's tools. You cannot believe that in the long processes of the ages any amount of light could have created the human eye, or any amount of vibrations of æther have constructed the human ear. You find there is an essential difference—something that cannot be estimated or measured, or explained—between mind and body; and while we hold the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, we have the truth of the mind's immateriality proved to us, as much as any scientific truth can be proved, by all those methods of observation and of reasoning of which the subject is susceptible. Then there is one other point, namely, the teleological argument—the argument from design; and that argument is strengthened the more human knowledge increases, and the more we understand the infinite variety of relationships that exist among all created things. I am not ashamed to fall back on the old-fashioned Paley for that argument of design, which even Mr. John Stuart Mill admits to be absolutely impregnable.

Some of you may have read the marvellous book of Sir Charles Bell, on the human hand; and some of you may have heard how Galileo took up a straw from the floor of his dungeon, and told his inquisitors that from that straw he could demonstrate the existence of God; and so from accumulative evidence we come to understand that there is a Lawgiver behind His laws, and by the teachings of conscience and the signs of immortality, we are delivered from the shackles of sense and brought close to the presence of the Creator of all. If we bear in mind these three facts—the fact, that man cannot solve the problem of creation, but that all his reasearch only shifts that problem backwards—the fact, that there is a world of mind as truly existing as the world of matter—and the fact, that there is an unanswerable argument of design,—then I feel assured that we shall not be afraid to face any of the evidences or the disclosures of Science.

Sir Antonio Brady.

My Lord,—I would crave your attention for a few moments, while I enter my protest against the humble followers of science being taxed as irreligious. I believe that in the whole circle of the sciences we have men as religious as those who are to be found in the ranks of any profession whatever. I will not even except the Clergy, amongst whom we have some of the most scientific men this world can boast. We have also our Herschels and a host of others, who are to be ranked with the truly religious men of science. But what I specially wish to protest against is, anything like dogmatism with reference to the scientific meaning of Scripture, which is not plainly revealed in Scripture. I hope I shall not be thought an irreligious man because I venture to differ from the statement which Archdeacon Freeman has put forth,—that the world is only six thousand years old, and that it was really made within the space of six natural days. [Archdeacon Freeman intimated that he had not so expressed himself.] I am glad to hear that denial, because there are two records which we have to consult,—the inspired written word of God, and the book of nature, written by the hand of the Almighty in the very rocks upon which we live.

Now, I believe, if there is one thing more certainly proved by geological facts than anything else, it is this—that our world was not originally created in its present form; and thus it has been beautifully remarked, that in scientific investigation you must go back and back until you come to the great Creator of all things. As a proof that this world was not originally created as it now is, we find the crust of the earth on which we live to be the mausoleum of creatures that have long since passed away, with some very few exceptions.

With respect to the argument of development—that an immense space of time was required to develope the various orders of created things—I believe that one of the oldest forms of life now existing is in the sea. I refer to that beautiful little mollusc, known as the Globigerina, which was found alive in taking the deep-sea soundings for the Atlantic Telegraph. Now I would say to Professor Huxley and Professor Tyndall, that our chalk hills are mainly formed of that identical mollusc; and it is calculated that many millions of them are required to make up a cubic inch. The Globigerina exists in our seas now, and is forming in the bed of the Atlantic chalk hills for future schools of divines to cavil about, when the land thus being formed shall have risen above the ocean. It probably took millions of years to make the present chalk formation, for these molluscs lived and moved and had their being in the seas of that period under conditions similar to those which now exist. But what I want to point out is, that the Globigerina has made no progress in development from the chalk period down to the time in which we live. The Globigerina of the chalk is the Globigerina still.

To go back to the period when it is suggested that the materials of our earth were drawn off from the sun or some other body, in a gaseous form, it is quite possible that the Almighty may have endowed that gas, or nebulous matter, or protoplasm, with this or other forms of life, and may have adapted it for being developed from time to time, as the world became prepared and more favourable for the higher existences. Who can tell? We first have the little Eozoon—a creeping thing—in the Laurentian limestone, where we have the earliest traces of life in the earth; and Sir William Logan has demonstrated its existence in Canada, forming rocks of enormous thickness, to the extent of 200,000 square miles!—so great has been the effect of life in modifying the crust of the earth!

That is a most marvellous fact, but it in no way detracts from the Creator's power; for, however far you go back, you are still carried back, and back, and back, until you come to the great Creator of all things.

I only desired to enter a protest against its being supposed that every person who follows scientific pursuits must necessarily be an unbeliever, because he does not accept the commonly received interpretation of the Book of Genesis. We have been told to-day a great deal about German theology, and neology, and all sorts of ologies; but we must come at length to this one fact,—that the Almighty created the heavens and the earth; though when that was done, it is not for us to tell; and I should like to ask Biblical scholars what possible evidence or warranty there is in Scripture, for assuming that the Adamic creation took place only 6000 years ago. I believe that the notations in the margins of our Bibles are of very recent introduction—not more, perhaps, than three hundred or four hundred years; and I think that the great difficulty of reconciling religion and science arises mainly from the wrong interpretations which we have been accustomed to put upon Scripture, from the want of adequate information on the subject.

CHARLES LONGUET HIGGINS, Esq.

MY LORD,—I do most heartily agree with the sentiment of a former speaker, who said he thanked God that he was born in the present generation; and I do so, because I believe that in these days physical science does offer the most humble, but at the same time the most noble, testimony to Divine truth. There may be, no doubt, certain cases in which it is supposed, wrongly enough, that physical science and Divine revelation are at variance; but if that be so, depend upon it that it arises, not from these things being at variance in reality, but from our want of accurate apprehension of them.

I would beg leave to bring before you one instance—and only one—to show how, at all events within the memory of most of us, science has contributed one very glorious fact indeed, in testimony of the Divine revelation. We read in God's word, and we know from it, that one of the attributes of God is His faithfulness,—that He is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever, and therefore we believe that His laws must stand and endure for ever. Now it is quite useless for me to talk to you about hundreds of millions and thousands of millions of miles, because we can hardly comprehend what these enormous distances really mean; but there is one fact which I desire to bring before your notice.

There are, belonging to the system of which we form a part, a certain number of planets which revolve around the sun,—Mercury, and Venus, the Earth, Mars, Jupiter, and Saturn. Now, it was for a very long time supposed that the last named planet was the last of the system. A certain number of years ago—not a very great number—[I beg to say that I am speaking this, not to be heard at all by my learned friends around me, who know about these things a great deal better than I do, but to the young people and children here to-day; therefore don't be too critical with me, but pardon me if I enter a little into detail] Saturn was supposed to be the most distant planet of our system. But it pleased God to give skill to a man to discover another planet so deep down in space, that I am satisfied very few persons here have ever seen it at all, as it requires an instrument of great power to enable one to do so.

In the course of the investigation of the path which this planet ought to take through the sky, it was found that at one point of its course it seemed to deviate a very small trifle—scarcely half a hair's breadth—from the line in which it ought to travel. Here, then, was a far distant world which seemed to present in its course a slight exception to the great general law governing the universe. Men accustomed to the accuracy of scientific investigation knew that this was impossible. The law could not fail. Two very eminent men entered upon the investigation of the subject. They thought that this slight deviation might be accounted for by the disturbing influence of a planet more distant still. They set to work to calculate what its distance, weight, and place in the heavens must be, in order that it might produce the deviation observed. A most abstruse and subtle analysis was entered into, the very faintest conception of which it is quite impossible that I can give you. When completed, observatories were set to work, and telescopes turned to the spot, and there, behold! was a little tiny spark of light, indicating the very world whose attractive power was drawing the former planet from its otherwise appointed course. Oh! blessed testimony of science to Divine faithfulness and truth!

This investigation was undertaken solely because of the certainty which these philosophers felt that the laws of God could not be in the very least degree departed from in any portion of His universe. Let us, then, be sure of this: that if, in any one thing whatever, the revelations of science should seem to be antagonistic to the revelations of God's holy, blessed, and precious word, it is only in appearance; and that, if we wait, at last in His light we shall see light.

The PRESIDENT now announced that the evening meeting, for discussing the next subject, would be held in the Lecture Hall of the Hartley Institution, as the Congress Hall would be occupied by the Working Men's Meeting. His Lordship also stated that the final meeting of the Congress would take place on the following afternoon, and that at the termination of it, all business connected with the closing of the Congress would be transacted.

THURSDAY EVENING, OCTOBER 13*th.*

The Right Hon. Earl Nelson took the chair in the Hartley Institution at seven o'clock.

THE DUTY OF THE CHURCH AS TO MIDDLE CLASS EDUCATION, AND THE ENDOWED SCHOOLS ACT.

J. G. Talbot, Esq. M.P., read the following paper:—

We live undoubtedly in an age of education. We are all either being educated or educating some one else.

And certainly whatever else may be the shortcomings of the Church of England, her Clergy, or Laity, in the present day a lack of interest in education cannot be laid to their charge.

But I am not here to give a general dissertation on the whole subject of education—I am limited to Middle Class Education.

This is confessedly the weak point in our Church system.

It is probably not too much to say that, two centuries ago, the Church of England had the whole of this work in her hands. I do not of course mean that if the Church had done her duty I believe there would have been no Dissent, no hostility to the Church, amongst the middle classes of this country; but I *do* mean that if the Church had used the vantage-ground she possessed at the Restoration, and continued to supply the needs of the population as it grew, she would have been mistress of the situation, and the seminaries of Dissent, still more those of irreligion, would have been insignificant exceptions.

The distinction between the different grades of Schools seems not to have been so strongly marked then as now, and therefore it is not easy to say how much of the education, which was so liberally provided in the years immediately following the Reformation, was what we should now call Middle Class Education. Much of it was undoubtedly as high as this, if not higher; for we know that one of the difficulties of the negotiations now pending between the Commissioners and managers of the old Endowed Schools is, that the managers are unwilling to part with the classical teaching which they have given so long. But whatever the proportion of what we should now call Middle Schools may have been, it is remarkable how very large a provision for Education, *more than Elementary*, was made in ages which we are accustomed to despise.

Only eighteen of what are now called Endowed Schools (of those that remain) were founded up to the reign of Henry VII. In the reign of that king seventeen more were founded: but these thirty-five were increased to nearly 100 by the death of his son. In the succeeding reigns the number was largely increased, and by the end of the reign of Charles II. the number of Endowed Schools was 573. It is remarkable to notice how many owe their origin to the reign of Elizabeth (the number is 138): and then to observe how few were founded in the even longer reign of George III. (the number is 30).

In the reign of George IV. only three were founded; in that of William IV. only four. It has remained for the present generation to witness a revival of that zeal for Middle Class Education which I contend ought to have characterized the Church during the whole of her history.

But in what position does she now find herself? Not certainly in a hopeless, nor in a contemptible position, but as certainly in one full of peril, needing all her energy, all her watchfulness, all her faith. The middle classes, who, two centuries ago, were in her hands, have grown to be a mighty power since then. Where and how have they been educated? To some extent no doubt in the Grammar Schools of the country, which the intelligence and public spirit of our forefathers provided in such abundance for the comparatively small needs with which *they* were acquainted: but also in great part in what are called "private seminaries," "commercial academies," "establishments for young gentlemen," with which we are so familiar in the outskirts of the Metropolis and other large towns.

But *how* educated in these Schools? I am not now discussing the quality of the secular instruction they have received; those who are interested in that subject will find abundant information in the recent report of the Schools Inquiry Commissioners; but what has been the religious teaching? I am afraid that even in the old Grammar Schools it has been in the main unsatisfactory, deficient often, and sometimes worse than deficient. In the private Middle Schools, is it uncharitable to say that the influence of the Church has been almost none? I am afraid that it would be hard to find a school of this class in which the children have been taught even the rudiments of the distinctive doctrines of the Church. They have generally imbibed two principles, and but two, of what may be called controversial religion. They have learnt a horror of Popery, and an external observance of the Lord's-day. But even of these they have never learnt the foundations. They seldom know on what grounds the able disputants of Rome are to be met, and are often found to denounce, as "Popish," practices or doctrines which were universally embraced long before the arrogant pretentions of the Bishops of Rome had reached even a fraction of their present height.

And with regard to Sunday observance, they have seldom been taught how the Christian Church has kept the fourth commandment: and often, in later life, being unable to maintain the literal strictness which had been unintelligently learnt, they fall into habits of almost entire desecration.

These, it is to be feared, are only instances of the miserably insufficient grounding which the middle classes have in times lately past (if indeed yet past) received in the first principles of the religion which they profess. Nor is this all—the Church having neglected her duty, room was found for others: and many of the seminaries of Middle Class Education have fallen into the hands, or rather have been erected by the hands, of those who professedly differ from her doctrines.

The middle classes are, as we well know, the stronghold of Dissent: and why so? I will not believe it is because the doctrines of the Church of England are not those which would commend themselves to the strong common sense, and the orderly habits of that great section of the community. I am sure it is not so; for where the doctrines of the Church are fully taught, without affectation, yet without reserve, I find the middle classes gladly and of their own choice availing themselves of Church Education. I know further that where the Church has been able to put forth her strength in the midst of a mercantile community, her work has been carried on with vigour, aye, with something of enthusiasm, by the members of the middle classes.

The reason for the estrangement I have referred to is mainly this: that the middle classes have—speaking broadly—been educated either by nominal Churchmen or by vigorous Dissenters. Let us not omit here to give to the Dissenters the credit which of right belongs to them: no doubt they have, by this large share of Education which they have so undertaken, acquired a vast political power, to which we have become so much accustomed that we hardly pause to wonder at it. But they have also instilled into the minds of a great section of the people some of the precious rudiments of the Christian faith—imperfectly indeed, as we believe, and not "according to the proportion of faith." Yet I think it is a matter of great thankfulness that there does remain in the great middle class so much of that deep, though often unconscious, trust in the truths of Christianity, which in other countries and in parts of our own country is so painfully absent.

I wish I could think that the Church has contributed largely and directly to that result: indirectly, I am sure she has: for by her unchanging formularies, by her "reasonable Services," and by the high tone of her Clergy, she has (thank God) held up, even through dark years of neglect and indifference, a bright standard of Christian truth, for which I know intelligent and candid Nonconformists are deeply thankful.

On the whole, as I have already said, the retrospect is a painful one; opportunities wasted, or only half used; a grand position forfeited; and the natural result has been estrangement and jealousy, where there should have been loyalty and confidence.

It may be thought that I have dwelt too long on the past: yet it is necessary to see where we have done amiss, in order to do better for the future.

What then is our work to be?

First of all, let it be remembered that we must now accept some of the conditions of our work, not as we would have them, but as they are imposed upon us. This I would especially apply to the case of the "Endowed Schools," as they are technically called. What is their present position? Their affairs are now being administered by a central Board of Commissioners, under the provisions of a recent statute of great stringency conferring upon them (the Commissioners) powers exceptionally large. This statute, known as the Endowed Schools Act, 1869, is the result of the Schools Inquiry Commission. That Commission was appointed in December, 1864, and their report is dated December, 1867. Amongst the Commissioners who signed the Report are Lord Lyttelton, the present Dean of Chichester and Mr. Thorold. Sir Stafford Northcote was also one of the Commissioners, although, being at the time a member of the Executive Government, he did not sign the Report.

I mention these facts and names to show (1) that the Commissioners bestowed much labour and patience upon their task, and also (2) that amongst them were men certainly alive to the claims of the Church, and well versed in her history.

It may be added that there were no such "dissents," appended to their Report, as have deprived a recent document emanating from a Royal Commission of much of its weight if not of its interest.

The verdict of the Commissioners upon the past career of the Endowed Schools was certainly *not* one of "Not guilty." And though I am not going again to stray into the past, it is necessary to remember that they gave full weight to considerations founded upon that past, in order to justify the sweeping nature of the recommendations which they made. If it could have been shown that the existing Schools were doing their work well, in a secular point of view; that they were teaching the doctrines of the Church of England intelligently to the children of parents who cheerfully accepted them; that, in short, they were good Church Schools in the midst of populations in which Churchmen largely and evidently preponderated,—I do not believe we should have had the Endowed Schools Act. But they did not find this; and I fear, for one, I cannot contend that they could have found it; the facts, with some noble exceptions, were far otherwise.

Their Report must have been accepted with something as nearly approaching to unanimity as anything so complex could command, in order to have allowed the passing of the Endowed Schools Act in the manner in which it passed. As a member of the Select Committee to which that Bill was referred, I can personally testify to the care as well as the moderation with which its clauses were discussed. But any one who had been present, would, I am sure, have agreed that the spirit in which the discussion was approached was, on the whole, acceptance of its principles, combined with an earnest desire to modify its details on the part of those to whom this Congress would naturally look to protect the special interests of the Church; very far different, for example, from the spirit of hearty dislike on the one hand, and earnest support on the other, with which the deliberations on another (the Burials) Bill were in the last session conducted.

We have then an Act passed, one may almost say *nem. con.*, in both Houses of Parliament, very carefully considered by a Committee of the House of Commons, founded upon the Report of a Commission in which Churchmen were certainly well represented. Is it wise, then—I had almost said, is it possible—for the Church to stand aloof from the work which will be done under that Act?

I cannot conceive that it is so: if it be, I think we had better retire at once from the position of a *National* branch of Christ's Holy Catholic Church, cease to attempt to have our share in the institutions of the country, and begin *de novo* in another Canterbury, hoping through another Kent to influence in the lapse of centuries another England. I have stated the hypothesis broadly, in order to show what seems to me to be the alternative of giving up what remains to us of our great vantage-ground.

It will be seen then that my first conclusion with regard to "the duty of the Church as to Middle Class Education and the Endowed Schools Act," is that she should earnestly throw herself into the work. And this in several ways—1st, in endeavouring to secure the presence of sincere Churchmen upon the governing bodies of these schools. By the 17th section of the Act the Commissioners are bound to "provide that the religious opinions of any person, or his attendance or non-attendance at any particular form of public worship, shall not in any way affect his qualification for being one of the governing body." That is to say, a Nonconformist on the right hand or the left, or a Secularist may be a member of these governing bodies. But that does not mean that the majority of any of such governing bodies are likely to be so; and I think it will be the fault of Church people if they are so. I believe I am correct in saying that in the schemes already published by the Commissioners, no governing body of which the majority would be likely to be hostile to the Church has been proposed. This surely is some source of satisfaction; and I believe the energy and discretion of Churchmen may maintain and even improve their position.

2ndly, In using all her influence to provide thoroughly good secular instruction *for girls as well as boys*, entering *e.g.* into such parts of the Commissioners' schemes as the "grading" of Schools, and providing for the progress of scholars from the lowest to the highest grades, as has been so well done in the excellent Schools of S. Nicolas College.

3rdly, In taking care to provide for real Church teaching, for the employment of Church schoolmasters who shall be able to give to their pupils an intelligent acquaintance with the doctrines of the Church, whilst at the same time they do not hesitate to give that *bonâ fide* exemption to conscientious objectors which the Act in certain cases prescribes.

I have had some opportunity of observing the spirit in which the Commissioners have begun their arduous work; there is much in it which is necessarily distasteful to me. I am unable to go along with them in their indiscriminate removal of gratuitous education, except as a reward for merit: they deal also rather summarily with existing governing bodies and with local claims. But, in what they do, they conceive themselves to be carrying out the Act under which they exist. And this must be said, on the other side, that they take great pains to make themselves acquainted with local feeling, and to adapt their schemes (so far as they consider themselves free) to local requirements.

That much good will result from their labours, I will not doubt; although in effecting that good, I fear many changes painful to the feelings of Church people, and in my judgment unnecessary, will be made.

But not only in co-operating with the Endowed Schools Commissioners, and taking part in the management of these old institutions, will Churchmen play the part which belongs to them. I have looked at the subject mainly in this connection; and others, no doubt, will speak more at length upon the work which the Church alone can do, and which most specially belongs to her. Yet I cannot conclude without saying a few words on this other aspect of the question.

There will never be a time, so far as we can forecast the future, when distinctively Church Schools will cease to be necessary—Schools founded by Churchmen, managed and taught by Churchmen, in which none will be taught but the children of Churchmen, or of those who wish to place their children under the influence of the Church, and in which no religious teaching but that of the Church of England will be given.

Of such Schools noble examples already exist in the flourishing institutions connected with S. Nicolas College in Sussex, already followed by another large school now rising in Staffordshire. Let us hope for these Schools a brighter future than the fate which has overtaken the ancient Endowed Schools; and at any rate let us in our day do that which many of our forefathers did in theirs. Let us, so far as we can, complete our own work, and let us stamp it with the character which we design it to bear, the clear mark of connection with the Church, and fidelity to her doctrines.

In the 19th section of the Act so often referred to, "any educational endowment, the scholars educated by which are . . . required by the express terms of the original instrument of foundation, etc., to learn or be instructed according to the doctrines or formularies of any particular Church, sect, or denomination," is excepted from many of the provisions touching religious worship and instruction which otherwise apply.

Let it be the care of Churchmen *now* to be at least as careful as were their predecessors to define what they establish; and let them provide, so far as any human provision can effect it, that the instruction which they design to give shall be worthy of the Church which they represent so that in the Middle Schools which the nineteenth century shall bequeath, true religion and useful learning may for ever flourish and abound.

The Rev. E. H. Plumptre, M.A., Rector of Pluckley, and Professor of New Testament Exegesis, in King's College, London, read the following Paper:—

Whatever view we may take of the two great Educational measures of 1869 and 1870, we cannot deny to the statesman who had the largest share in framing them the merit of taking a wide, far-reaching view of the problem with which he had to deal. Our reforms in Education had worked their way downward. Much had been done for the improvement of our universities and the great public schools. It was left to Mr. Forster to organize on a wide scale our primary and secondary schools, to provide for the Educational wants of the middle classes and of the poor. My task to-night leads me to dwell on one part only of the work with which his name is connected. I can only note the fact that the two measures are part of one great whole, not as yet completed.

The Endowed Schools Bill came before the House of Commons, it will be remembered, as based upon the Report of a Royal Commission that had been sitting for some years. As it was originally framed, it consisted of two parts; the first, which ultimately became law, providing for the re-organization of the endowments and governing bodies of existing schools; the second, for a vast system of centralized inspection, intended to bring the middle-class schools of England and Wales as much under the control of the Educational Department of the Privy Council, as that of our elementary schools is under the new system. The second part was dropped in order to ensure the safety of the first, and was hardly brought under discussion. The time was not ripe for it, and so for the present it is shelved. But there can be little doubt, I imagine, that before long, possibly in the coming session, it will appear again. I shall venture, therefore, to touch upon this part of the measure also, as well as on that which passed into an Act, and indicate what I believe ought to be the policy of the Church of England in regard to both.

I. It might seem to many as if the whole tendency of the measure was unfavourable to the influence of that Church. It throws open to others what had before been open to her sons alone. It deprives her of prerogatives which she has possessed for centuries. It imposes on all endowed schools the restraint of a conscience clause. Parents may claim for their children an exemption from "attending prayer or religious worship, or from any lesson or series of lessons on a religious subject." If the teacher tries to evade this provision by "teaching any particular religious doctrine, systematically and persistently in other lessons," the governing body is to make all proper provisions for remedying the matter complained of. Religious opinions, attendance or non-attendance at any particular form of religious worship, are no longer (except in certain special cases) to affect any man's qualification for being one of the governing body of any Educational endowment. All restrictions confining the masterships of such schools to persons in holy orders are summarily abolished. All Episcopal jurisdiction, visitatorial or otherwise, is transferred to the Endowed Schools' Commissioners. To this transfer of existing machinery from the old system to the new we have to add, that Educational endowments attached to one locality may be applied to the wants of another, and that endowments hitherto applied, according to the wills of founders, to other purposes, apprenticeship fees, doles of bread or money, and the like, may be treated as Educational, and so applied to enlarge the scale on which the Act will work. Funds left to the education of boys may be applied, in part at least, to that of girls.

It might seem, I say, to many among us, as if all this were one more severe blow struck at the Church's life, one more heavy discouragement to her influence in Education, one more example of what some among us look on as a sacrilegious disregard of the intentions of the dead. What seems to them the perilous latitudinarianism of the conscience clause, against which they have struggled so long in their parish schools, meets them once again. Can they acquiesce in such a system? Are they not driven back from participation in the old endowments under these new conditions, and thrown upon their own resources? Can they do anything better than organize new Church middle-class schools in every Diocese, after the pattern of those at Lancing, Hurstpierpoint, and Ardingly?

I venture to think that this is not the only, nor the wisest, course open to us. I yield to no man in my admiration for the noble-hearted founder of those schools. No one now living among us has done a greater work for the Church of England than Mr. Woodard; and he has done it, for a long time with scanty recognition, often under unjust suspicion. But I own that I should see with regret the multiplication of schools entirely after that type through the length and breadth of England. Explain it as you like, the very thoroughness of Church life in them, the absence of any element of comprehension, the warm support they have received from one section of the Church,—these have associated them, rightly or wrongly, in men's minds, with the action of a party, in a way in which other schools, such as Marlborough or Cheltenham, have not been associated. And the natural result of this has been seen, first in suspicions and whispers, which I for one have always regarded as ungenerous and untrue, and secondly, in the appearance of a rival organization. A Middle-class Schools Association for promoting Education on "Christian and distinctively Protestant principles" has been announced. The familiar names of the wealthier supporters of these "Protestant principles" appear on the committee. A school based on them will, I suppose, be started before long. I confess that I cannot look on this prospect with any great satisfaction. Whatever respect I may feel for the doctrine of Progression by Antagonism, however fully I may admit that it is better the work should be done in this way than not done at all, I am compelled to think that it is an evil and not a good that Education should assume the sectarian, seminarist type which this antagonism makes inevitable, that our children should from their earliest years be thus ticketed as High Church or Low, that even the cricket matches of the future should be connected with the triumph of Protestant or Catholic principles. Were the issues of things according to their apparent tendencies, one could only see in these rival systems a machinery for perpetuating our unhappy divisions in *sæcula sæculorum*. Our comfort is that in such matters the good that men do "lives after them," while the evil is "oft interred with their bones." Whatever is needlessly distinctive, needlessly exclusive, may wear off with the friction of years, and the schools, spontaneously, or under legislation, assume a new character.

I will add that those elements in the Endowed Schools Act, which appear to some of us most antagonistic to the traditional prerogatives of the Church of England, are precisely those which I must regard as right and just in themselves, and therefore sure, in the long run, to work for good and not for evil on her influence. It is, I believe, at once the right and the duty of the State to make all Educational endowments available, as far as may be, for the whole community and not for a section only; and this cannot be done in the present relations of the Church and nation, without leaving secular instruction, with all its advantages and encouragements, open to those who are unable to accept the dogmatic teaching of the Church. The intentions of founders, based, as they were, upon a state of things altogether different from that with which we have to deal, cannot and ought not to be allowed to interfere with arrangements which are now demanded by the interests of the country. To set up those intentions as of paramount obligation, is to assert that the dead, and not the living, are the sovereign controllers of the nation's wealth, that each individual holder of that wealth has an absolute, indefeasible right to direct how it shall be appropriated through all ages. That conception of the rights of property we ought, I believe, to get rid of, as the superstition of a selfish individualism. The power which is the creation of law, law can regulate, and, if need be, suppress. Just as we accept the transfer to Educational uses of endowments that were intended for uses now obsolete or mischievous, or to one locality of those intended for another, so, the difference being one of degree and not of kind, we are bound to admit the legitimacy of a like transfer to a higher use and for a wider good. And if, under this principle, Educational endowments are no longer to be administered for the exclusive use of members of the Church of England, it follows also that they can no longer be administered exclusively by them. Free participation in the management of a trust, by all who are interested in the trust itself, personally or by representatives, is the only security against the suspicion and ill-will sure to arise when it is in the hands of a section only. And in this, as in other matters, the gain of interesting the members of all religious communities in the well-being of institutions by which they all profit, instead of leaving them to a passive acquiescence in its management by a body which does not, and cannot, represent them, is, I believe, something quite incalculably great.

The sum of all this is, that in the future Education of the middle classes, the Church of England will have to rely, not on the prerogatives of the past which are fast drifting away, but on the influence of which no legislators can deprive her. It will be our wisdom to look the fact steadily in the face, to accept it as inevitable, even if we regret the surrender, and to make the best of the condition in which we find ourselves. And that condition gives, I am persuaded, every ground for hope. Keeping in view our own ideal of what Education ought to be, holding that it cannot be complete unless it extends to man's higher life, and that the religion which should be its foundation should show itself in worship, tone, character, as well as in formal lessons, I come to the question whether, and in what way, Churchmen can take part in working the machinery which the Endowed Schools Act brings within their reach. It is with satisfaction that I note the fact that in one English county the problem has been practically solved. The meeting held last week at Exeter, in which Bishop Temple, Sir Stafford Northcote, and Sir J. D. Coleridge took part, sets an example which will be followed, I trust, in every part of England. Speaking generally, it would seem the duty of Churchmen in this matter to do the work which lies nearest to them, to look into the local endowments, originally Educational, or capable, under the Act, of being applied to Education, and to see in what way they can be made most effective. They must be content, it may be, to sit at the same Board with men of other creeds than their own, content to forfeit the security they have hitherto found in placing a Clergyman of the English Church as head-master of the School. Seen at a distance and in theory this looks alarming enough. But all things are "less dreadful than they seem," and prudence, temper, considerateness, the absence of the proselytizing spirit, will do much to make influence under the new system stronger than prerogative under the old. They will find, in most cases, that the desire of parents that their children should be religiously educated, will lead them to accept an amount of positive dogma which will at least furnish a basis for the boy's maturer life, and that exceptions will be adequately met by the conscience clause without hampering the teacher's freedom. They will find in many cases, that the governing body of which they form a part, though no longer restricted in their choice of masters to men in holy orders, will yet be willing to accept them, if otherwise fitted; that if a layman be appointed, he may do as much as any Clergyman to give a religious tone to the work in which he is engaged. All this may be gained by the action which originates in the feeling that we are members of a nation as well as of a Church. It will all be lost by a policy of indifference, by suspiciously holding aloof, by open antagonism.

We must be prepared, however, for the other alternative. There may be failure and disappointment. Churchmen may be out-voted. The master may be a dissenter, or an unbeliever. The instruction given may be that of some sect more or less heretical, or that of a so-called common Christianity, which is sometimes equivalent to Theism without a Christ, or the system of the schools may be one of secularism pure and simple.

What in that case is the duty of Churchmen? Not, I believe, even then, to withdraw and wash their hands, but to do what good they can, tied and crippled as their hands may be; to see that what is taught is taught well; that the moral discipline is as effective as it can be under these conditions. This, it seems to me, is their plain duty as citizens; in the strictest sense of the word, their "duty towards their neighbour." But then there lies on them also the obligation to supplement that which they feel to be defective. And this may be done, I doubt not, in many ways. I note two or three of the most promising.

(1.) Where the Endowed School meets the Educational requirement of the town, as regards its numbers and the character of its teaching, but is, in its religious aspect, unsatisfactory, it is open to Churchmen to establish classes for instruction at hours left free from school work, on week-days or on Sundays. Parents who care for that element in Education will welcome the supply, and will be ready to profit by it. It will offer a wide field for the work of intelligent Laymen, who at present limit themselves to teaching the children of the poor in Sunday Schools. An extension of the present agencies for preparing candidates for Confirmation, carrying the work over a much longer period than is commonly assigned to it, as is the case in Sweden and Protestant Germany, would obviously help to give a more definite character to religious impressions that had before been vague and lax. Evening classes, carrying the instruction to a somewhat higher level, so as to embrace Exegesis, Dogma, Evidences, Church History, would, in all large towns, have a fair chance of attracting young men and women during the four or five years that follow their leaving school. All this would require, it is true, more than guinea subscriptions—would call for energy and devotion on the part of Laymen as well as Clergy. If this be thought a fatal objection, one that shows the suggestion to be chimerical and visionary, I can only answer that I am unable to conceive of any plan for prolonging the life of the Church of England, or extending her influence, which does not involve those requirements. Is it too much to hope that English Churchmen will follow the example of Montalembert and his friends when they had to meet a like difficulty?

(2.) It is clear, however, that in many cases Educational Endowments will not meet the requirements; that, over and above all Schools so supported, there will be room for others. Here, then, a fresh field lies open for the activity of Churchmen. The Act itself seems to invite their labours in one special instance, and though the extent of those labours will be far from commensurate with the necessities of the time, it is itself sufficiently important to call for special notice. Cathedral Schools are exempted from the liberalizing provisions of the Act of which I speak. Whatever Endowments they possess may still be supplied for an exclusively Church Education. It is not, I suppose, uncharitable to say that in many cases these Endowments have suffered from neglect or time; but there is clearly here an opening for utilizing them as the nucleus for Diocesan Schools acting on a larger scale. Under a better system of Cathedral organization than that which now prevails, the Master of the Schools might be a Clergyman chosen for his educational fitness, and be recognised and remunerated by a Canonry. It would be, at all events, a gain to secure the residence of at least one Canon for a longer period than the statutable three months.

(3.) Schools like those of Mr. Woodard, to which I have already referred, have here their fitting place. I have ventured to point out some of the drawbacks which attend their working; but I recognise fully that a time may come when the witness which they bear will be much needed, and when we may be thankful to see them entering into vigorous competition with Schools which may have become secularized. If there were time to enter into details, I would suggest the inquiry whether they are not in some cases trying to work on too large a scale. The judgment of some of the best masters in England,—notably that of the Head-Master of Marlborough,—is against this massing together of eight hundred or one thousand boys, unless this "hostel" plan, as it has been called, which has been adopted as the cheapest, is largely supplemented by boarding-houses. And at the risk of returning to a topic on which I have already touched, I will express my belief that the real work which these institutions do for the Church would be furthered by their applying spontaneously the rule which is imposed by law on all Endowed Schools, and trusting to the influence of Church teaching and Church life, each of which they may, of course, develope freely, without making participation in either an indispensable condition of admission.

II. There remains the system of general inspection, organized by a central Board, which appeared, as I said, as the second part of the Endowed Schools Bill of 1869, and will probably form part of some Educational Act in the nearer future. I do not attempt now to enter into the details of the scheme. Some of them—especially those relating to the amount and incidence of the charge for inspection—seem to me to require reconsideration. But the leading principle of the plan—that of bringing all Endowed Schools under inspection, and inviting others to submit themselves to a like process—is, I believe, every way admirable, as steering a middle way between two extremes. On the one side there is the system, or no system, with which we have been too long familiar, of leaving the education of all but the children of the poor to take care of itself. How this has worked we all know well enough. The greater schools of England, strong in their historical reputation—strong, too, in the character of most of those who administered them—influenced, too, by their relation to the Universities—have, with some drawbacks, done a great and admirable work. Each has had its traditions, its *genius loci*, its inherited characteristics of good and evil; and the public opinion of England, and, I may add, of Europe, has testified to the predominance of good. The smaller Endowed and Proprietary Schools have sometimes slumbered and been inefficient; sometimes have been narrow and archaic in their plan of education, and need, it may be, the changes which it is the object of the Endowed

Schools Act to bring about. But, beyond all this, there has been the widest scope given to the speculations of educational adventurers. The columns of our journals still show an amount of touting advertisements of which we can hardly dare to hope that one in ten rests upon anything but pretentious assurance. Local, or so-called middle-class examinations, come in and supply, in some degree, a test of efficiency. But that test is, at the best, vague, and may be misleading. It shows that a given school possesses the power of turning out a few clever boys with the ability of rapidly reproducing what they know, so as to satisfy examiners; not that the whole school is taught and organized as it should be. This defect has been acknowledged; and an attempt made to meet it by the University of Cambridge. But this, too, works as yet unsystematically, is given only where it is asked for, and is asked for but by very few. What is wanted is a central, organized system of inspection for all schools, from the highest to the lowest grade, not crippling spontaneous activity, nor bent on producing a rigid uniformity, but seeing that work is done as it ought to be, and giving to parents of the middle class a guarantee which they have, at present, no means of getting.

The possible evil to which such a system is exposed is, of course, that of engendering a vast bureaucracy of inspectors and secretaries, and crushing out the vitality of local energies by a rigid centralization. We have all heard the boast of a French Minister of Instruction, as he took out his watch at twenty minutes past ten, that at that moment every boy in every *Lycée* in France was doing a given page in a given manual of history; and something like that might be apprehended, in working any measure such as I have described. But the machinery of the Endowed Schools Bill will be found, if I mistake not, to meet the danger. The part that was eventually passed does all that can be done to quicken local energies. The changes in the constitution of boards, governing bodies, and masters, all tend in the same direction. Everything is done to insure such a representation of the various interests of those concerned, that there is no ground for fearing that we shall have the evils of a system in which all originates with a bureau, and all educational workers are government officials. It is well, perhaps, that that part of the machinery has been allowed to work freely for some time before it is brought under the control which it will eventually need, and so to gain the strength which will save it from succumbing unduly to any depressing influence from the state's supervision. Local activity, municipal freedom, central regulation,—these will be found the three conditions of safety and success in dealing with the educational, as with the social and sanitary, problems which England has to face.

The Rev. R. Gregory, Canon of St. Paul's and Vicar of St. Mary the Less, Lambeth, read the following paper:—

By the middle classes we understand all who derive the resources on which they live, partly from personal labour, partly from invested capital; and it matters not whether such capital be invested in education or in merchandise, in what adds to the value of the labour of the hand or of the head, in what produces uncertain gain or regular income. This definition is not exhaustive, but it is sufficiently accurate for our purpose.

These classes must therefore include all who are seeking to better their condition, to rise in life, to win a fortune. So soon as men of the lowest class, by thrift or by ability, improve their position, they begin to rise into the lower ranks of the middle classes, whilst younger branches of the highest class fall into the ranks of the middle classes when they join some profession or trade by which to earn income.

The middle classes will therefore necessarily be the ambitious classes; the great majority of them, in a trading country like England, occupy doubtful and shifting positions; the individuals of whom they are made up will seldom end life where they began—they will either rise or fall; their children will probably be upon a higher or lower level than themselves.

The education, therefore, which they will require ought to be adapted to this state of things,—ought to be such as will fit them for a more responsible future as well as for a useful present. When the great avenue by which men rose to wealth and power was the Church, with all the varied employments in civil as well as in ecclesiastical affairs to which the stamp of her Orders was the passport, there was but one kind of education given, and that was education which would fit men for such offices. Our Grammar-schools were founded when such instruction was the only kind of education valued, and their statutes require them to impart such an education, and that is known as a classical education.

With no special reason for varying the type of education, it continued for centuries such as it was at first. The study of Greek was added to that of Latin about the time of the Reformation; but substantially the ideal of middle-class education till the end of the last century, and perhaps during some of the earlier years of this, was classical. The shopkeepers generally in such of our large towns as possessed good Grammar-schools studied Latin and Greek. Such an education qualified many of their sons for the learned professions, which were largely recruited from their ranks, whilst it added to the cultivation of many, and was no doubt the cause of such men as Isaac Walton occasionally appearing in their ranks.

With the rapid development of trade and manufactures, during the last half century a good deal of this has been changed: the ambition of a large proportion of the middle classes has been concentrated upon the pursuit of wealth through the new channels of industry opened to them. The upper divisions of them may still wish that their children should receive an education that will elevate their tastes, refine their manners, embue their minds with a love of literature for its own sake, and qualify those who receive it to fill the highest offices in Church or State. But the great mass of the middle classes take a lower view;

they look to immediate advantage; they make the acquisition of wealth their great, if not their sole, aim in life. They find that its possession is thought to ennoble; that its ownership is a passport to society that used to consider other qualifications essential; and that to be rich secures many marks of external deference and outward respect, as well as all the comforts and luxuries which money alone can procure. To accumulate wealth has therefore become the one ambition of a large proportion of the middle classes; and the tendency seems to be for such pursuit to absorb in increasing numbers those who might have been expected to seek distinction in some higher sphere.

For such pursuits a very inferior education is thought to be best. The desire is for the mind to be absorbed by its one pursuit, and for it to be distracted as little as may be from that which is held to be its special business. Certain attainments are necessary for carrying on the routine of trade; and by its success in imparting these it is held that a good education must be measured. Neatness and exactness in writing and ciphering, diligent and painstaking attention to specific duties, regularity and punctuality in fulfilling what has to be done, and intelligent observation, are the chief qualifications for the successful prosecution of commercial affairs. The education required for such a life is of a very mechanical kind; such portion of it as is intellectual is soon acquired; it is purely elementary; whilst the larger portion can be best secured by early initiation in the actual routine of business avocations.

It was the demand for such an education as this by the lower ranks of the middle classes that deprived many of our Grammar-schools of a large portion of their pupils, and rendered it essential to reconstruct the cycle of studies in all that were not designed to carry on that system which finds its highest development in our Universities. The greater portion of the boys designed for mercantile pursuits were sent to schools which realized the idea of commercial education just described; and where to read and write and do sums were the chief, if not the only, things taught. The length of their school life was short; most of them leaving when they were fourteen, or even sooner. It began to be considered mere waste of time for boys intended for commercial pursuits to study Latin or Greek, or any form of literature which would possess no direct money value in after-life. As trade with the Continental nations increased, there grew up a demand for the study of modern languages; but the one idea which governed this system of education was present, immediate utility. It recognised no aim that was not material; it utterly disregarded that mental discipline and cultivation which had been one great object sought by a classical education. And though the ranks of the middle classes included an ever-increasing proportion of the population, they have been to a great extent for some years, and are still, receiving that imperfect style of education just described. Of all the children at school, about one-third are at private schools; many of these are of course at mere dames' schools, intended for children of the poorest class; and no doubt many middle-class private schools are better than those I have described; but my own personal knowledge, confirmed by such private testimony as I have been able to procure, and the reports of the different Education Commissions, lead me to fear that the great majority are most unsatisfactory.

So that I believe the lower ranks of the trading classes now receive a very inferior education to what they did at the beginning of the century.

It is obviously the bounden duty of the Church to provide, so far as she can, that the education of none of her children be limited to purely earthly objects. The struggles of life have a natural tendency to make men over-anxious and over-eager about such things, to lower their aims rather than to elevate them; it is therefore essential that if their hearts are to be quickened by love for more ennobling objects or pursuits, such love should be implanted in their youth, that they should start with an elevated ideal. It was necessary, to meet the new order of things, that a new curriculum of study should be accepted,—that more directly practical and useful learning should be imparted; but it was not less necessary, that, together with such learning, instruction should be given in subjects that would invigorate the soul, that would fire it with love for something higher and nobler than material prosperity, and that would help to preserve it from the baseness which perpetual grovelling after filthy lucre is certain to engender. History, poetry, the literature of our own land, provide such subjects. Whilst for the training of the mind, as well as for practical advantage, some branch of natural science may be advantageously studied, provided that something more than a mere superficial smattering of its rudiments can be acquired. I do not speak of religious instruction, only because I hold that in all true education religion must underlie every part; that, as our Lord is the Alpha and the Omega, the beginning and the ending of all good, so faith in Him must be made the governing spring and motive of all obedience and desire for improvement, of all discipline and emulation; and I believe that all so-called education, which severs the tutoring of the intellect from the moulding of the affections and the training of the whole man for the service of God, must be unsatisfactory and eventually degrading.

In what further I have to say, as my time is very limited, I will leave out of my consideration the upper divisions of the middle classes who avail themselves of classical or superior schools, and speak only of those who seek such an education as will fit them at a very early age to take part in commercial life, and whose social position requires that it should be supplied to them at a very moderate cost.

It seems to me to have been very unfortunate, that when the country began to awake to a fuller sense of the value of popular education, some thirty or forty years since, these children were not its first care, and that early efforts were not directed to the benefit of this most important branch of the community, either by adapting existing schools to present wants, or by founding new ones, or by both modes of procedure. Instead of this it was generally assumed that they could care for themselves, and all thought was expended on those occupying an inferior position. The consequence has been, that in numberless cases the poorest children have received a better education in well-managed National or British Schools, than have the children of the lower divisions of the middle classes in the pretentious private academies in which the great majority of them are taught. This has been productive of two evils. In many cases the labourer has been better educated than his employer, which has helped to make him dissatisfied with his lot in life, and his master jealous of the advantages accorded to those in the poorer ranks;

whilst the lack of a better education by those occupying the place of capitalists, has effectually hindered in other ways that elevation of the labouring classes through the class for which they toil, which ought ever to be going on, and which has probably been one great cause in producing the envy and jealousy that have created that wide gulf by which capital and labour are so frequently separated, and of those perpetual contests, issuing in strikes and lock-outs, by which the country is agitated.

It is not unimportant to ascertain (even though it be very roughly) the number of children for whom such an education as that of which I am speaking is required. Mr. Dudley Baxter, in his carefully prepared lecture on our national income, estimates, from income-tax assessments, that there are in England 57,300 persons enjoying an income of above £1000 a year; 178,300 persons with incomes ranging from £300 to £1000 a year; 1,026,000 persons with incomes from £100 to £300 a year; and 1,497,000 persons with incomes below £100 a year. If we suppose that all with incomes above £300 a year seek education for their children in classical schools, and all with incomes below £300 and above £100 a year require a commercial education for their sons, we shall rather err on the side of assigning too large a proportion to classical schools than too small. But look at the result that such an estimate would give. For the 235,600 persons with incomes above £300 a year we have all the higher and more expensive schools, such as Eton, Harrow, Winchester, Charterhouse, St. Paul's, Merchant Taylors', Rugby, etc., all the grammar-schools (strictly speaking) throughout the country, and all the recently-founded schools, such as Marlborough, King's College, Rossall, etc.; whilst for the 1,026,000 families with incomes ranging from £100 to £300 a year which require something more than a national school education, what have we?

It is difficult to answer, only because it is difficult to realize the miserable inadequacy of what has been done for them. Middle-class people with incomes of less than £300 a year (most of them with incomes much less) cannot be expected to pay more than £20 a year for the board and education of each child if sent from home—than £5 a year if at a day school; in the latter case the child has to be fed at home, and in both cases he has to be clothed, kept in health, and provided with some amusement. We must therefore exclude from our consideration of provision for these classes all schools charging more than £20 a year for board and education—than £5 a year for day-school education. Even the middle-school of that noble contribution to the educating power of the country which has its home at Shoreham, and owes its foundation to Canon Woodard, and its vigour and efficiency to the admirable men he has associated with him, is more costly than our limit; whilst the lower school, recently removed to Ardingly, is more definitely designed for the classes of children now under consideration than any school I know. Next to this come the county schools, which are most useful and valuable; but their annual charge is for the most part greater than the sums I have named, and they no doubt largely number amongst their pupils boys who would otherwise have been educated at classical schools. Some of our well-known public schools have opened a modern side where boys are trained for the higher walks of trade; but the cost renders these inapplicable for the classes whose case I am considering. I know of no other public boarding-school in the country but the one I have named that comes strictly within our limits: so that for three-fourths of the middle classes no public boarding-school exists but that at Ardingly and those which are eleemosynary, such as Christ's Hospital; and yet from these classes mainly spring those who make great fortunes by trade, who employ thousands of hands, who set the tone of public opinion in large neighbourhoods. A few of the cleverest children, or of children whose parents make great sacrifices for their welfare, may be educated at more costly schools; but for the great mass of them who enjoy neither of these advantages, except some re-organized grammar-schools, and a very few day schools in large towns provided for their special benefit, there is nothing but our national schools, where they may obtain a good elementary education side by side with the poorest children in their neighbourhood, and commercial academies where they will pay for being exclusive by being worse taught. They are therefore too generally condemned, by the apathy of those who ought to care for their instruction, either to associations at school which will have a tendency to lower rather than to elevate them in after life, or else to spend the years devoted to education in acquiring the merest smattering of knowledge, and so to pass through the world with that self-assertion and narrowness of view which want of real cultivation generally brings in its train.

Within the last two or three years there have been two general efforts to improve this state of things. The one is a special fund set on foot by the National Society for promoting schools for the lower middle classes; and the other is the passing the Endowed Schools Act of 1869. Of this last we will speak first on account of its greater importance, though in point of time the other agency is some two years its senior.

The object of this Bill is to adapt endowed schools to present requirements, to meet the destitution of which we have been complaining by utilizing existing endowments for the purpose. The desertion of many of our old grammar-schools, from the cause of which I have spoken, and their consequent decline, had produced a state of things which clamoured loudly for a remedy. Such a remedy this Bill is intended to provide. It confers large powers upon the Commissioners who are to carry out its provisions; and, though disliking many of its enactments, I certainly hope its operation will be for good under the auspices of its excellent chairman, whose zeal in the cause of education has been so abundantly proved in various ways. I do not imagine the religious teaching given under the new Bill will be inferior to what was imparted under the old state of things; though I cannot but regret that many teachers had so grievously fallen short of fulfilling the intentions of the munificent founders of the schools over which they presided, that restrictions upon freedom in teaching religion, such as are found in this Bill, should only stereotype the state of religious instruction in schools which were for the most part founded with the special design of being nurseries of the Church.

In re-casting the schools committed to their control, the Commissioners must necessarily lay down such a scheme of education as will be really acceptable to the classes for whom the schools which they remodel are designed. They will no doubt be content to accept the requirements of trade as furnishing the key to the branches of study to be pursued; and whilst these should be partially varied to meet the differing needs of different neighbourhoods, they should take care that underlying the system of education on which they insist there shall be teaching that will elevate the mind, civilize the man, and, so far as may be, help to Christianize society. They will have to seek to allure youth to the schools they reorganize, by providing for them the education best suited to enable them efficiently to fill the positions in life for which they are preparing: but in doing this they should never forget that education has a much higher object to fulfil than fitting men to make money; they should endeavour to set on foot schools that will mould those they instruct into being good citizens and real Christians. One special point on which they ought to insist is, that their curriculum of study shall be such as to secure sound and not superficial attainment, and that it shall include some subject by which the mind may be healthily trained to promote its own better education in after life. Nothing is so likely to rear conceited, self-opinionated men, who scorn the idea of their needing further improvement, as a superficial smattering of knowledge, which fails to reveal to its possessor how little he knows. It is this which is the special curse of many of our private-venture schools.

It is to be hoped that the Endowed Schools Act will help to accomplish much for the classes of which I am speaking, by imparting new life to existing schools, and by making them efficient for some of the purposes for which they were founded; but it is well to remember that this Act contains no power to found new schools in places where they are needed and where there are no funds existing which it can apply to the purpose. The only funds over which it will have any control, except those belonging to the existing schools, are such as may arise from the suppression of charities designed for giving doles in money or kind to the poor, marriage portions, redeeming captives, relieving poor prisoners for debt, making loans, providing apprentice fees, or for the advancement in life of poor children, or for any other purpose which has failed altogether, or has become insignificant in comparison with the magnitude of the endowment, if originally given to charitable uses. From these sources it cannot be expected that many new schools will be founded. They will probably assist in making more efficient existing schools; but as such charities are chiefly found in parishes which have fallen off from ancient greatness, and not in those which have recently sprung up into being places of importance, and as local claims are rightly to be considered, I do not imagine that we can expect the operation of this Bill to secure middle-class schools in many of the towns and populous places where they are most urgently needed.

It is not impossible that the Elementary Education Act of this year may indirectly lead to the opening of schools for the lower middle classes, by the conversion of some existing elementary schools to that end. It is not improbable that in some places, with the power of levying rates, the fountain of private benevolence will be partially dried up, and that, in consequence, some existing schools will find it difficult to keep open their doors. Under such circumstances I should hope that no managers of Church Schools will be so unfaithful to their trust as to hand over their schools to School Boards; but it may be the very best thing that could happen if they were to raise the fees charged to an amount that would make them self-supporting—say from half-a-guinea to a guinea a quarter—and thus educate within their walls a number of children who are now condemned to the inefficient teaching of private-venture schools. There is nothing in the trust deeds to prevent such a conversion. If the Committee of Council on Education wished Her Majesty's Inspectors to examine the children in such schools—which could be required by the terms of the trust deeds—it would be the very best thing for them that could happen; but in no other way could the liberty of managers in making the change here suggested be interfered with.

But for places where neither of these methods is available for the foundation of good day schools for the lower middle classes, help may be obtained from the Middle School Committee in connection with the National Society. Its grants are about the same with those made by the Committee of Council towards founding primary schools. Several schools have been thus established; and their number has been limited, not by the Society's inability to help, but by indisposition on the part of Churchmen to found fresh schools, when everything around them seems so shifting and uncertain. Still the work requires doing. Much good would result from its being successfully undertaken; much evil must follow from its being neglected. Schemes are afloat, and one very large one in London has been matured, for providing secular schools for children of this class. I believe that the founders avoid the word "secular," and euphemistically describe their school as teaching "unsectarian religion." What that wonderful thing may be, is more than I can understand; all I know is, that it cannot be Christianity, for that is essentially a dogmatic, and so, in modern phraseology, a sectarian religion. For, as St. John tells us (1 John iv. 3), "Every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come;" and (ii. 22), "Who is a liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? He is antichrist that denieth the Father and the Son." More dogmatic statements it would be difficult to find; so that, if our religious teaching is to be accommodated to what St. John—speaking by Divine inspiration—requires, it certainly cannot be unsectarian or indifferent.

The duty of Churchmen, therefore, in this matter seems to me clear. It is—in spite of all the discouragements that are being heaped upon them from day to day—to make another venture. I would ask them to do their best that the children of the lower middle classes may be no longer neglected—may no longer be taught in the miserable, unsatisfactory way that many of them are at present—but that they would, for Christ's sake, help to provide good day schools for them wherever they are needed, and secure them to the definite end of their being good Church schools as well as good secular schools by every means in their power. Let the Endowed Schools Act be made the most of, wherever there are school or other endowments which can be rescued from waste and be utilized through its instrumentality; but where there are not, let the spirit of self-sacrificing liberality create what is required. Let that spirit, by which the Church has won all her victories, once more arise in its might; and though the foundations may seem to be shaking, there is a Rock beneath which standeth for ever sure; upon it faith must rely, in spite of all the world can do to perplex, or thwart, or hinder. The children of the kingdom must be content to trust all to their Lord, assured that in doing so they will be blessed; the water-floods may threaten to engulf what they found, but if the work undertaken is Christ's work, the venture must be made; and the morning light of eternity will certainly reveal to them their reward, if the perversity of man should prevent its previously appearing. But we may surely hope for a speedier blessing than this; and that in this world, as well as in the next, the promise shall be fulfilled—"In due time ye shall reap, if ye faint not."

The Right Rev. THE BISHOP OF OXFORD.

MY LORD,—I think that a good deal of time has been wasted in this Congress by some speakers, who have spent a portion of the space allotted to them in explaining why they spoke when they had not intended to speak. However, I shall not waste time on this occasion, if I do dwell for a moment on the reason why I am now addressing you, when I had not the smallest intention of doing so. It has been already explained to you why Sir Percival Heywood is not here; and here I may venture to say, that no person would have been more fit to address us on the subject of Middle-class Schools than Sir Percival Heywood. He is, as many of you know, the munificent founder of a great School, now rising in the Midland Counties, in connection with Canon Woodard's foundations; and the zeal which he has shown in forwarding this work leaves us no room to doubt the large experience and the ample knowledge he would have brought to the discussion of this subject had he been here to-night.

In now addressing you, I will say how it appears to me that Sir Percival Heywood, and others like him, may have viewed this question. I think they may have looked upon the state of the country, and heard people say—as they have said thousands of times—that the Church has the sympathies and affections of the upper class, and the loyalty of the lower class, but had no favour in the eyes of the middle class. That has been said over and over again, and I think such persons may, perhaps, ask themselves, "Why is this? Are we to take this as a statement of facts which we are to acquiesce in as inevitable? Is there anything in the nature of the Church and the middle class absolutely incompatible? It seems to have been assumed that persons in this social condition would be *a priori* Nonconformists. Is there any reason for this assumption?" It surely may be answered that there is no reason in the nature of things, but that persons in this class are brought up to be what they are; and it may be naturally asked why people in that class should not have opportunities of being brought up with the same religious advantages—for, of course, we think them advantages—which are enjoyed by the classes above and below. And so clearly do men like Sir Percival Heywood see this, and so strongly do they feel it, that they have been induced to give—and the act of giving tends to strengthen their feeling upon the subject—large and munificent donations to the rising institutions amongst us. However, I do not pretend to represent the excellent persons engaged in this work; and perhaps if I go on, I may say something inconsistent with their views. I admire them, without entering into all their feelings; but I could not help noticing, when Mr. Plumptre read his excellent paper, that while he gave the full measure of credit to the founders of the institutions connected with St. Nicolas College, he appeared to speak of them with a little distrust, and almost to depreciate the multiplication of them to any great extent. He seemed to make the distinction between these Colleges and other Academical Institutions rest simply on this ground—that the one represents an exclusive opinion or dogma, while the Schools now rising by their side entertain an adverse sentiment in regard to religion, or, at all events, give power and scope for it. But I think there is another distinction—and I am sure he knows it very well—which he did not bring before us. It seems to me that the most important distinction of all between Institutions like those in Sussex and in Staffordshire, and ordinary Schools, is, that the teachers and managers do their work in love, and not simply for money. You heard just now from Mr. Talbot a description of the state of things in our Schools in the last century. It seems to me that that was not merely an age of defective religious feeling, but that the persons engaged in the work of Education for the most part engaged in it as a profession, out of which they expected to make a certain amount of money, and got rid of it as soon as they could. It appears to any one who has carefully and anxiously looked into this matter, that you cannot educate properly unless you have your heart in the work. We say that of most things, but pre-eminently of Education. It is absolutely impossible to go on teaching without some liking for it; it is absolutely impossible to go on against the grain, year after year, grinding boys, without either coming at last to a lunatic asylum, or altogether giving it up. There must be a heart in this work—a real wish to do something for the children. Now that is just what you get in institutions established on the principles of the Schools in Sussex. Christian men unite and live together, not for the sake of large incomes, for in some instances their incomes are very small. You can support half a dozen workers in these Colleges for what you would have to pay one in some other Institutions. They go there to engage in a noble and hearty business, which they love, and which they feel honoured in supporting. These things are going on in such Schools as I have mentioned; and I could appeal to other examples—in the Diocese of Oxford, and elsewhere—of the same loyal devotion to the work. That is the thing we want to get. Some one may tell me that there is such a thing as loyalty and enthusiasm for learning itself; and that in the past century, even when religious motives were weak, there were persons who from the very love of Education gave their time and energies for the purpose of imparting instruction to others. That principle of enthusiasm for learning, I admit, does exist; but it is one of the rarest things you can find. Now the enthusiasm for bringing up children in the fear of God, and making them good Christians, as well as learned scholars, is far more common—thank God for it!—than the other kind of zeal. It has its attractions for persons of various kinds, and often induces men, not otherwise greatly distinguished, to give their cordial support and their valuable service to the cause. Therefore, I think Schools of this kind are to be encouraged—such Schools as those connected with Canon Woodard's most eminent name—because you get a great amount of unbought energy and steady earnest devotion to work, for little or nothing, when you may pay ten times as much for a thing not worth half the value in any other way. On the mere score of economy, then, I should say that Schools conducted on Christian principles—Schools calculated to promote a loyal and hearty Church feeling—are those which will serve us best, and which, for the sake of the nation, we are bound to encourage.

I must apologize for in any way attempting to address you, because I know I do not adequately fill the place of one who would have been here had he been able, and who has manifested such a deep interest in the establishment of thorough Educational institutions; but if I have succeeded in putting before you some of the ideas which occupy the minds of those whose actions prove their interest in this important subject, I shall not have occupied the few minutes allotted to me in vain.

A. J. B. BERESFORD HOPE, Esq., M.P.

IN speaking this evening on Middle Class Education I find myself absolved from dwelling long upon a topic which, two or three years ago, or at almost any previous Congress, I should have dwelt upon strongly. My duty then would have been to have pointed out a topic which the preceding speaker has handled namely, the significance and value of the series of Middle Class Schools organized by Canon Woodard. It is no longer necessary to bring these schools under your consideration, because they have secured their place in the country. Some people accept them absolutely—others only accept them with a doubt, a doubt I think misplaced; but as it is, there they are, accepted by all. They cannot be shaken. Liked or disliked, they are recognised by every one as a significant part of the Educational machinery of the country. I am not telling tales out of school, when I say that in the important select committee, to which, in company with my friend, Mr. Talbot, I belonged—that on the Endowed Schools Bill, which sat during the session of 1869—some one happened to ask the question, "Are the Woodard Schools exempt from this Act?" and that Mr. Forster, our chairman replied, "They are; and if they were not, I would move a clause to exempt them." Nothing more than that need be said upon the general system of these schools. Those which already exist are, as you know, only first samples of a much wider series, of which the one at Denstone, in Staffordshire, although in progress of building, has not yet been established, owing to a very material obstacle. When once this is overcome, that one will be at work like the others in Sussex. Henceforward, and as the sequel to Denstone, I hope a great chain of schools will spread over the land; for it is impossible thoroughly to test the system, still less to leaven the people, by a few schools created in Sussex and in Staffordshire.

To come to the general question of Middle Class Education, we must shape our ideas upon the relative numbers and characteristics of the population in various districts in order to understand our present requirements. We have not merely to look at a flourishing middle-sized town like Southampton, or glance at the hill and dale, woodland and meadow, of a county like Hampshire; for there are the manufacturing and trading centres of the north, where the hard hands and longing souls congregate, for whom this education should be provided; and the Middle Class Schools must be pushed forward, and every elevating and consolatory machinery of which, the Church is master must be presented and fearlessly brought home as it has only yet been in some few places. This leads me to a topic merely touched upon by Canon Gregory, which is worthy of our very serious attention—namely, the future Education of that class of society which, by a sort of strange compliment, we call the lower Middle Class, but whom we should rather call—I do not wish to hurt their feelings, and nothing I may say can rightly do so—the class of limited self-reliance; that is, the class whose subsistence is precarious, and gained by personal enterprise, and not through the comparatively certain channel of the wages which they earn from employers. The persons who technically belong to this class require a helping hand from their fellow-citizens, as much as those whom we artificially call the lower class, to whose schooling the arrangements connected with Elementary Education are somewhat exclusively limited. I ask you, What must be the Education provided in the future for the lower middle class? Does it not stand to reason that if they themselves, ratepayers as they are, are ready to create rate-aided schools under the new Act, they will do so with the view of having their own children educated in those places, and of course in that undenominational Christianity, so called, which has been so well described by Mr. Plumptre that I need not describe it again; we know that the Christianity, minus Church, minus dogma, minus distinctiveness, with which we are menaced, will become the form of so-called Christianity presented to this class, at all events in our towns, unless we bestir ourselves. I think the remedy is a very simple one. Do not keep up an artificial distinction between the wage-earning class and the so-called lower middle class. Appeal to common sense, break down the barrier, and try to get the lower middle class children sent to the Elementary schools; get them to our parish schools. This, I know, is difficult in the country. I have wasted breath and time in trying to persuade farmers to send their children to the National school. There was a small endowed school at a place in which I am interested, and I tried to induce the lower middle class, who ought to have derived some advantage from that grammar school, to merge it in the National school and make it a general school. Class pride and prejudice stood in the way. There may be many more places like that; so I appeal to those who value Education, and care for the Church's influence at this crisis, to try and bring small farmers' sons and small shop-keepers' sons into our National and Church schools. Look at human nature as it is. Do not mind giving them a bench to themselves, so far indulging their pride, even though you may be unable to see the logic of the step. Get them there; that is the essential thing; but do not mind giving way to a little pomp and parade, which you may not respect yourself much. If that is the price at which you can win them there, I say, pay it, and be thankful. So also in the towns, do work amongst the small tradesmen,—do work amongst the small provision-shop keepers, and such classes of the people. Wherever you have a good thriving Church school in the town, get them to send their children there. It will do a great deal of indirect good in many ways. It will bring the children of the artisan into immediate contiguity, in point of learning, with a class which, without much warranty, they regard as superior to themselves. They will learn what that class thinks and is; and the other class will on its side learn what they are. If the experiment succeeded, a more kindly feeling would subsist between the classes, and the change would promote in each party more respect for themselves, as it increased the respect for each other. You may win this lower middle class by tact and good management; but if you neglect them, ruffle them, or forget them, they will be swept into the vortex of rate-aided undenominational schools, and will be lost, I will not say to the Church, but to Christianity itself, in the vague and sentimental theism of that Education of the future, which, in too many cases, will be the result of school-board elections promoted by canvassing, and placards, and stump speeches in many of our large towns. I appeal to you simply to get upon and work upon the different education boards, committees, and other organizations. Bring this necessity forward—agitate it. This is the time to face this matter; this is the time to work it. You have the leverage and a very good leverage it is, to work—in appealing to your poor parishioners to avoid a rate if they can. These state-aided schools, when once started, may become popular from the feeling of self-assertion of those who put themselves forward to be managers. But no parish or community loves a rate for its own sake. If you can induce the lower middle class, by swallowing a little class pride, to condescend to send their children to the National school; or if you can find means of compromising with that pride in view of the result, you may keep off the levying of a rate with its resultless undogmatic schools, and you may extend Church teaching to that section of society over which the hold of the Church is now unhappily the weakest.

ARCHDEACON EMERY.

I AM very hoarse to-night, and yet I feel I must trespass for a few minutes upon your kind attention, as this subject of Middle Class Education has engaged my thoughts a great deal during the last three or four years, in connection with a project for establishing a county school for Cambridgeshire. I quite agree with what has been mentioned by other speakers, that the Church of England has much to blame herself for, in not having at the present time a good set of public schools for the lower and upper middle classes.

Our ecclesiastical authorities have really in our grammar schools had the power, if they had but exercised it, of visiting these schools and seeing that they were properly conducted. Now, though it is not absolutely required by the Endowed Schools Act that the Bishops should lose their visitatorial power, I am sorry to find that the three Commissioners, as far as I can understand certain drafts they have put forward, have made up their mind that under no circumstances shall the Bishops retain that power. I think this is a strong reason why our Bishops and all ecclesiastical authorities should henceforth give greater attention to, and watch the progress of, Middle Class Education, though I despair of our Bishops being able to do it till we get, what we ought to have had long ago, an increase of the Episcopate. This Endowed Schools Act is certainly a most sweeping measure, and will put tremendous power into the hands of three Commissioners. Yet at the same time, the advice you have received from Mr. Talbot and other gentlemen is, I am sure, the right advice, that, as Churchmen, it is our wisdom as well as our duty to co-operate, as far as we possibly can, in assisting the Commissioners to work the Act, and cover the country with good Middle Class Schools—Schools for girls as well as boys; and I trust good day-schools as well as good boarding-schools. It seems to me also that throughout England the attention of educationalists, and persons of importance in the Church of England, should be directed to the trust-deeds which the Commissioners are inclined to propose for the different schools. I have had the pleasure of speaking to two of the Commissioners, who received me very kindly, with respect to the school I had in my mind; and one of them was good enough to give me three drafts of projects which they had suggested. I will just give the general scope of these. They seem to contemplate, especially, three kinds of schools:—a simple English school, then a school where Latin shall be taught, and then what may be called a high classical and mathematical school,—the three being graduated according to the wants and according to the means of the various classes of the community. I have nothing to say against such projected schools, and I think the drafts are on the whole wisely and judiciously drawn up. But, looking through these schemes, my attention has been principally directed to the religious aspect of the propositions. I have just been looking at them again to refresh my memory, and it is to me evident that the Commissioners are acting very clearly according to the powers which the Act gives them; but I think they have drawn too hard and fast a line with respect to the Bishop not being under any circumstances a Visitor. If the Act in any way permits that, in certain cases, the visitatorial power of the bishops may be preserved, I must say it is a little unfair to determine off-hand that the Bishop shall in no case be a Visitor. I do not consider the Commissioners, even according to the Act, have indeed any right at once to say that they will not, under any circumstances, notwithstanding even it be proclaimed as the determined wish of the neighbourhood, allow the Bishop of the diocese to be a Visitor of the schools. Well, looking also at what they have drawn up, it would seem almost as if the religious teaching of the school must be what is called unsectarian; though I do not think this is a necessary deduction. The schoolmaster certainly need not be a clergyman, but the draft schemes of the Commissioners do not seem to me to lay down any conditions with respect to religious education. That will in fact, as I read the plans, be left to the Governors; and therefore the importance of the advice given, that Church of England people should do their very best and strive in their several neighbourhoods to get a good governing body to start with, because upon this governing body to a great extent will depend the future of every school. I have in my mind a certain school which, on the whole, though conducted on so-called liberal principles, has resulted in great good, and which was directed into a good channel by the fact of a good head-master, a Church of England head-master, being chosen. A great effort was made the first time to choose a Unitarian; and I am convinced in my own mind that if he had been elected very different results would have followed to what have followed. Therefore I say it is prudence and wisdom on the part of those connected with the Church of England to do their very best to get good, honest, religious, and, if possible, Church government. Then I see a very important clause in this Act, namely, that there may be, and it is contemplated there will be, chapels for worship—chapels distinctively connected with the worship of the Church; and of course, supposing you were to have various endowments for the establishment even of unsectarian schools, yet it will be in the power of voluntary effort to establish for these schools places of worship—at least for those boys in the school who are connected with the Church of England. And don't let Church of England people be always afraid that they are in a minority and think they will be put down. The hearts of the people are with the Church of England, and the hearts of the middle-classes also: I think I can give you a proof of this. Take the great Bedford middle-class school, which is established, you may say, on an unsectarian principle. The head-master there is required to be a Trinitarian Protestant only. What has been the result? At the first, there was certain opposition to the whole scheme on the part of those who, excellent men as they were, took, I think, too narrow a view, and thought they ought to have nothing to do with such a school. At length, wiser views prevailed, and Churchmen and religious men assisted the effort of the Duke of Bedford to raise a middle-class school. When the governors met together it was found that the majority of the boys sent to the school were really Church of England boys—and what they did was fair enough: they built a chapel and appointed a chaplain of the Church of England. I think this will be the case with respect to many, at least, of the new schools founded under the Act; and I do not think we need be frightened. I have nearly done, because I only wanted to speak on two or three great points; but I wish to say one thing with respect to a particular class of school which has been mentioned—I think in one of the papers—and that is, Cathedral schools. Now it so happens that I am very closely connected with the cathedral school of my own diocese, being, as Canon, one of the governing body. We had an idea, and we may still have the idea, of making that into a County school. The Dean of Ely, with this view, made certainly what we considered a liberal offer, in the name of the Dean and Chapter, to the County; but I confess this—that, having looked at the schemes of the Endowed Schools Commissioners, I do not, as at present advised, feel inclined to hand over the endowments of our Cathedral school to a body of governors who shall have no necessarily religious opinions: and unless these are treated as essentially Church foundations, I think our wisdom will be throughout the country to improve and extend Cathedral schools on a distinct Church of England basis, as far as possible by ourselves, without seeking assistance from the Act. What may be called the general religious opinions of the country will have Government schools established to meet them, in connection with the Endowed Schools Commission; so I think we need not be called narrow, or sectarian, if we endeavour to give a more distinctive character to a few special schools. I am, however, quite in favour of a conscience clause, and so far disagree with Canon Gregory. Otherwise I thank that gentleman for the mention he made of our Cathedral schools, and heartily agree with his suggestion that they should be, as much as possible, made the foundation of Diocesan County Church of England schools. In conclusion, I trust we shall not be frightened; but that, like loyal subjects, we shall assist the Commissioners to work out the grand scheme of covering this country with good schools, and that we shall accept the advice of such excellent friends to the Church as those who were on the original commission for this Act. In this way I believe we shall make all our people more religious and more loyal, and shall be doing after all, notwithstanding these schools may not be distinctively Church schools, one of the best things for making the middle classes thorough Church people.

The Right Rev. Bishop RYAN, Rector of Bradford.

I THANK Archdeacon Emery for speaking of day schools, because I think they are most important for the Middle Class Education of the present day. In all our large towns in the North there is a large element of the population ready for good Church Middle Class Schools. Now these people in the North have been described as a money-making and money-getting people; but I am glad also to describe them as a *money-giving* people. I do not know a more liberal element in the population of England than the men of the North. I will illustrate what I mean. I went to take a church in an important parish at Bradford, and there I found an effort was being made for the enlargement of a Church literary institute, towards which a Layman had just given £500. I applied to him for new schools, and received £500, another Clergyman applied and received £100, another £50, and in a fortnight £3421 were subscribed out of £6,000 which we needed for our new schools. I think therefore, I have a right to represent such liberal supporters of our Church work as money-giving people. Let me now recall to your memory an effort which was made as far back as the year 1840, at Liverpool, by some hard-working Clergymen, who were liberally supported by the merchants of the place, while such noblemen as the late Lord Derby, Lord Egerton and others, generously gathered round them; and this led to the establishment of an Institution such as, if we could see the like throughout the whole land, I believe, would enable the Church of England to recover any ground she has lost. It was an Institution over which there was but one principal, and there were three schools—the upper school, the middle, and the lower. At the lower school the pupils paid £4 a year, and they were taught an English education, and French. At the middle class school, at which £12 a year was paid, an excellent education was afforded, with French and German instead of Greek. At the principal school there was every appliance for a classical education. In the first class of that school there were at one time twelve young men, every one of whom had matriculated at the Universities. A youth from the national school passed into the lower school, from thence into the middle, and from thence into the upper; and then something happened, or else he might have gone on to the University. There were four exhibitions—the Gladstone exhibition, a McNeile exhibition, the Master's exhibition, and some other I have forgotten. The consequence was, that any youth who exerted himself, and was of right moral conduct, could pass from the national school to one of our Universities. When Mr. Howson took the school, there were about 600 in it, and one of the most interesting features of all was this:—I heard the Bishop of Chester say that no prizes gave him such pleasure to present as the prizes given the young men—clerks and others in the town, who had finished their education in one sense, but who felt they had a great deal more to learn, and after engaging in their various avocations during the day, came to the college to be instructed in French, German, drawing, and other things, at night, showing that they valued the education which they received within the college walls. I think if we could multiply institutions such as this throughout the country it would be a most effectual means by which the Church of England could recover, and fasten her hold upon, the affections of those growing up, and play an important part in the direction of the future destinies of the country. There is one very important matter which has been impressed upon my mind since I have been in Yorkshire. I believe no means of raising and educating the middle classes will be efficient unless schools are supplemented by Institutions. Now I confess that when I went to Yorkshire I had not such a favourable idea as I have now in regard to Mechanics' Institutes. At a place not far from Bradford a Mechanics' Institute was commenced at a cost of £13,000, and when this noble institution was inaugurated, I was asked to offer the dedicatory prayer.

I have been told that in Southampton you have something of the same kind. There was a large sum of money—I am told £100,000—left to found this Hartley Institution for the benefit of the inhabitants of Southampton. Here you have a most beautiful lecture-hall, and, what I regard as more important, excellent class-rooms; and if you wish to carry on Middle Class Education in a satisfactory way, you must provide these various institutions, and provide class-rooms and other means by which these young men, after they have been obliged to go forth and earn their own living, may come and finish their education, as far as they can, by attending these different classes in the evening.

As to this Endowed Schools Bill, yesterday I was in company for an hour or more with the Commissioners respecting a school at Bradford. One point which strikes me very much is this—that we should enlarge these schools. Take a town like Bradford, with a population of 254,000 within a radius of four miles, as an instance, in support of this remark. Make the schools fit for the requirements of modern science; but don't shut out those who were included in previous times. Every one of the Clergy in Bradford wishes his son to go to a University if he can; and there are many of the lower middle class and those above them who would greatly distinguish themselves if they were able to go to a University; and I am sure the history of the Universities shows how very many excellent men we have had from these classes. Therefore I contend that you should supply as fully as you can all the requirements of modern times; but not exclude any young man in Bradford or any other large town, from going to a University if he has the wish to do so; and who can tell whether, like Mr. Pendenbury, of Liverpool, he might not go forward and succeed as he did at Cambridge, where he was enabled to gain this year the high distinction of Senior Wrangler?

The Rev. THEOPHILUS BENNETT.

As a clergyman who was once beneficed in, and who therefore once belonged to, the now disestablished and disendowed Church in the sister country, I must say I am extremely happy to hear all the remarks which have been made in this room this evening; for I do think, and verily believe, that if the Clergy of the Church in Ireland had shown the same interest in national, middle-class, and higher-class Education that the English Church shows, the Church in Ireland would not have been disestablished and disendowed. Therefore, I was glad to hear from Archdeacon Emery that we had no reason to fear;—and allow me to endorse that remark, by saying that as long as the Church of England is as attentive as she now is to the education of the people, so long the Church of England will have nothing to apprehend, neither need she fear being dethroned from the high position she now occupies.

We read in the Gospel, that when they heard the grown-up people shouting Hosanna, they disregarded it, but when they heard the *children* shouting Hosanna to our blessed Lord, they then began to think there was something in it. And, my lord, if we keep the affections of the junior members of our flocks, there is no fear, I think, for the future of the Church of England. Therefore, I was extremely pleased to find the deep interest taken in Middle-class Education: and here allow me to thank Mr. Beresford Hope for his remarks. I think that the Clergy ought to show more sympathy than they do with the middle classes of this country. I think it would be desirable that we went sometimes and had tea in their back parlours, and that we showed a general friendliness to them. I consider that while we are attentive enough to the higher orders, and go much amongst the lower orders—as a body, the middle classes, and especially the *lower* middle class, of which Mr. Beresford Hope spoke, do not receive that amount of attention from us Clergy of the Church of England which they ought to have. Perhaps pride has something to do with it. I know it is much harder to visit a greengrocer, for instance, than a large number of those in the poorer and wealthier classes. It is much pleasanter to go into the nice rural cottage, such as was described last night, with its pure air, than into stuffy public-houses; and yet we ought to visit them, and to "follow sinners even to their alehouses," specially because *they* chiefly require attention. I knew a Clergyman who always visited public-houses; and being at one time Curate to him, he directed me to do the same. Public-house after public-house I went into—(laughter)—(I do not want to say that I drank anything there, because I had never anything stronger than water in any of them); but it was not an easy task, when nearly every other house in one street was a public-house, and there was such a house at every corner.

I am glad to see the interest taken in Middle-class Education; and I remember preaching at Hertford before a glorious gallery of 450 boys with their Bibles in their hands. That was a glorious middle-class School, and I should like to see many of them. Of all the scholars I ever met, I never met a better-conducted set of boys, and never felt more pleasure in ministering to any individuals than to these little bluecoat-boys of the town of Hertford. Then we heard of middle-class and county Schools. In Dorsetshire, I am happy to say, we have opened a very magnificent School, in a healthy situation near Dorchester, and the Clergy take great interest in that School. The Clergy have examined in classics, in mathematics, in modern languages—they have examined in English and in French; and as far as I can recollect, our Dorsetshire poet (Rev. W. Barnes) gave a very favourable report indeed of the way in which the pupils acquitted themselves in French. A previous speaker made a remark about deficiencies in spelling, but I am happy to say that in the School to which I am referring the spelling was remarkably good. I think that is high testimony, because it is in this particular that most young men chiefly fail. We have one county School in Dorsetshire, and I should be glad to see such Schools multiplied all through the land.

But I must not occupy your attention, for I suppose my time is nearly up. I have spoken already of our sympathy with the middle classes, and the desirability of the Clergy, as a body, showing more sympathy with them; but now let me just allude to one other subject. Perhaps a great many people before me may differ from me upon this matter, and I approach it, therefore, with diffidence. What is the duty of the Church with regard to Middle-class Education? What is the duty of the Church with regard to all kinds of Education? I was happy to see such a spirit of friendship pervading our deliberations; and I was pleased also to see the Lord Bishop of Winchester, as he alone can do, throwing oil upon the troubled waters. Some people have urged against this Congress that all we do here is to talk—that we talk, and talk, and nothing comes of our talking. Now I wish one thing would come of our talk—I should like, as far as my talk is concerned, to say what I should say if I was a school-boy myself. What is the duty of the Church with regard to Education? I answer—to mollify it; to give rather more reward, and less punishment. You are all familiar with the lady who made a polite curtsey, and put nothing in the plate; but the Scotch deacon collector said to her, "Gie us mair o' your siller, and less o' your manners, my lady." I think we ought to give more rewards and less punishments,—we ought to give cakes rather than the rod in our Schools. I notice that dissent is expressed to this dogma, but I do hope it will go forth to the world that one speaker, at least, even though he has been called to order for it, has advocated as much as possible the disuse of the rod or cane in Schools,—that one speaker has advocated, as part of the duty of the Church of England, that we should, as far as we can, conduct our Schools upon the principle of love, and of appeal to the school-boy's honour (as has been already explained to us); that we should teach our children to work from love, and work from a principle of honour; and that we should not allow schoolmasters to take the cane in their hands, and make it the substitute for diligent work on their parts. I think if masters taught children more how to learn, and gave them less of the cane, it would be better for the children, and perhaps better for the masters also. Horace composed an excellent motto for every schoolmaster and teacher, when he said,—

"Blandi doctores dant crustula pueris."

The Rev. A. R. Ashwell.

After the very flattering speech you have just heard from a gentleman who, having undergone Disendowment and Disestablishment, comes here to express his belief in the security of the English Church, and after his deprecation of the rod in English Schools, I feel that I speak at a disadvantage, inasmuch as I must go back to less pleasant things, and speak of the pressing exigencies of our position, and touch on points of dry detail in the work incumbent on us. For we may be sure that —however the rod may be given up in our schools —it will unquestionably descend upon ourselves if we do not attend to the details of our work for God and for the Church. And again, my remarks must necessarily be fragmentary and disjointed, inasmuch as I wish to touch on certain matters which have come before us in this debate.

First, as to the Endowed Schools and their Commission. This evening's meeting was opened by a very careful, instructive, and elaborate address on that subject, and it occurs to me to add a fragmentary remark or two thereon. I come from two counties in which I may say that there is as much work of reconstruction to be done—as much work of clearance in the first place and reconstruction in the second—as perhaps in any part of England. I may therefore mention what a few simple Clergymen and Laymen are trying to do in the cause of education, as a mere suggestion to those in parallel circumstances elsewhere. The case is this. A few such persons, of accurate local knowledge, have formed a committee with a view of watching all proceedings. They have put themselves in communication alike with the Trustees of Schools and with the Secretary to the Commissioners, with the view of acting as an advising body as to ulterior arrangements—a body likely to take a wider view than the Trustees of individual Schools, and perhaps a more accurate survey of actual local needs than the Commissioners. Of course everything is yet in suspense, but they are doing what they can; and, being met frankly on both sides, they are trying to elicit some order out of the existing chaos, and recommend a workable scheme, with central Boarding Schools planted systematically over the two counties, having exhibitions to them from the Day Schools grouped around them. This kind of effort is perfectly within the capacity of any of the Clergy and Laity in any part of England.

One gentleman who has preceded me has spoken with great kindness as to one of the nineteenth-century names which Englishmen must ever reverence. But in reference to Canon Woodard's Schools, he seemed almost frightened to recommend their extension, lest it should cause some other body to rise up on the other side of the Church hemisphere and set up some other Schools of their special type of Church feeling. This subject has been talked over in the little coterie I spoke of. Unfortunately, we do not see our way at present towards securing any of that money which we have been told flows so freely at Bradford, and cannot enter upon any course which would involve the outlay of thousands of pounds, like that at Denstone. Still we *see the need*. Mixed a body as we are, we see that if this reconstruction of the Endowed Schools is to bear fruit in real religious Education, what is wanted is some central uncompromising standard and example of what that Education is,—some School or Schools which shall stand out and say, "We teach Church of England doctrines, and will do it well, so well, that our rivalry shall drain these Endowed Schools of pupils unless they teach it as faithfully as we do." I have no hope, spite of the roseate anticipations which have been put forward to-night,—I have no hope of a solid practical religious training according to the Church's idea of what that means, in the general run of our resuscitated Schools, unless there be some large bold venture made in every district or diocese which shall hold up a true standard of what that Education really is. If so, others will work up towards it in some degree, not perhaps entirely, but still in a measure, and the existence of a standard will counteract the infinitely numerous lowering agencies which in our populous districts it is worse than childish to shut our eyes to. And thus the Woodard Schools will confer a benefit on the whole of England far beyond their own immediate pupils.

I may add, in reference to this subject of Middle Class Education, that for three years I have had to act as University Examiner of the selected pupils from Middle Class Schools in a northern district, and that I had to look over papers in what are called English subjects and also in religious knowledge. I grieve to say that the knowledge of the Prayer-book was too often worse than *nil*, for the pupils imagined they had such knowledge when they had it not. As to Holy Scripture, some of the best papers I had were from the children of Dissenting Ministers, and were not the result of School teaching at all.

I pass on from this disagreeable experience to say a word or two about the elections to the new School Boards and our duty towards them. And what I feel is this—that if we let the chance go by of at once securing good men and true upon these School Boards, if once we let other people get the possession of them, our chance is lost for ever. It will not be a pleasant position. We must be prepared for a great deal that is disagreeable in the discussions at these Boards, for having our favourite views and, what is more, our deepest principles for a time over-ridden; but it is far better for us to be there, even though temporarily beaten to a certain extent, than to withdraw and leave other people free to convert all that the Church has done for *her* religious education to the purposes of that nineteenth-century monster of *undenominational* religion. Far better to put up with the annoyance of being on Boards, where for a time perhaps we may be outvoted, and so to bide our time, until in the long run, we may prophesy, our superior experience and knowledge of the work will show themselves in contrast with the inexperience of those who get elected to oust us, and those who have quietly borne the brunt of the battle in the Board-room will find their old influence returning strengthened and not diminished by the contest. Therefore, I say, whatever we do, let us avoid abstention; let us keep whatever hold we can, though it be but by our finger-ends.

I have nearly used my time, but there is one suggestion made by Mr. Beresford Hope which I should like to notice. It is that we should draw the children of the better class of artisans into our National Schools. This is really one of the most valuable and practical suggestions I know of. According to the present system of Government School Grants, those Grants are paid in respect of the pupils so long as their own payment does not exceed *ninepence a week*. Now ninepence a week, *plus* the Government Grant, is a great help to the School, as well as its being a great thing to get the class of children who can pay the ninepence under your teaching. I say then, if you can get that class of children into your School, make a class for them and charge them the *ninepence*. You will be securing two results by this. You will raise a larger income from school pence, and so benefit your School by its increased means. You will also be teaching the very class which at present escapes us most of all, while it is a peculiarly important one. And then, thirdly, these are just the scholars whom you can produce the most impression on, for they stay longer at School than any others. I will only add that I have seen the experiment tried; and that of all the institutions I have had the good fortune to be connected with, the one where it was tried has been the most successful.

The Rev. G. C. Harris, St. Luke's, Torquay.

It has been frequently maintained as one great reason for failure in respect to the Middle Classes, that there was isolation on the part of the Clergy from these classes. Several means have been proposed by various speakers, for dealing with this subject of Middle Class Education, if once it should come within the reach of the Church's hands; but there still seems one link left out, on which, perhaps, one word may yet be spoken, namely, as to the way of breaking that very isolation which has been so often referred to. My own feeling is, though my experience is not so great by a considerable degree as that of many of those who have preceded me, that while a large proportion of the lower middle class, and of the shop-keeping class generally, have as a matter of fact been alienated from the Church, yet there is no class, from the highest to the lowest, who more cordially welcome overtures from the Clergy, or who render more hearty co-operation after the ice has been once broken between them. Surely, having this feeling—and I speak not altogether without having tried it—we may have some comfort even under those circumstances which have not been contemplated by measures proposed by the different speakers. The picture which was held up by Mr. Beresford Hope in such roseate hues, reminds one of a proverbial enterprise, whereby a certain animal is cooked for dinner before it has been caught.

If I were asked, whether a tradesman's son could be educated in a national school, I should say, Certainly, in most districts; and I think I should be borne out in saying, the best thing is to get children of the lower middle class to attend an ordinary national school. There are places too where Endowed Schools have not existed, and therefore can in no shape be made available now. There are also places at such a distance from cathedral centres, that it is impossible to send children to schools in connection with them as day-scholars, while, perhaps, the means are not available to send them there as boarders. Therefore, after all that has been said, there still seems to me to be a field for noble enterprise on the part of individual Clergymen; and, feeling as I do that the class referred to are willing to welcome us if we go really and freely among them, I have very little doubt, that the experiments I have seen tried by the Clergy in different places, and have tried myself on a small scale, may be made to answer extremely well that is, throwing our energies not only into the national school work, but also into middle-class school work on our own account. We have spent a great deal of time, a great deal of money, and a great deal of energy, upon the former class of schools. It is extremely probable that in many districts these schools will henceforth be supported in a way which will not make them cause the same drain upon the private benevolence of our congregations as has been the case hitherto. May we not then face the prospect of trying to bring back some of that stream of benevolence into the channel we have before us to-night? And when we take into consideration one further reason, that amongst the schools referred to in the excellent papers which have been read, there are some which have been described, even by their advocates in general, as schools where a system of theism without Christianity is taught, is there not a still further claim upon us as Clergymen to endeavour to provide in our small towns and in villages other schools for the class we are considering? It hardly meets the case to say—and I have great diffidence in differing from the gentleman who said it—that after leaving our children for a certain number of years to be educated where this species of theism prevails, it will then be sufficient to send them to an evening class and other places of Education where more distinct and dogmatic Christianity will be taught. Let us suppose that instead of this kind of theism, there was taught in a school a particular form of religion. Supposing Roman Catholicism was taught in the school. Would the bulk of a Protestant people send their children to a Roman Catholic school for some time, because in the after years of their educational life they might be sent to other schools where a purer form of religion was taught? Surely they would say it was an absurd proposition, that their children should have instilled into their minds direct teaching for many years, which they would afterwards have to labour to undo. The answer may be, "You are speaking of a very strong dogmatic system of religion which is sure to imprint itself upon the child's mind, and therefore sure to leave its mark." Granted—but are we to have this theism taught that I am speaking of? I think we have the highest reason for saying and feeling that if the mind and soul of man are neglected as regards spiritual matters by those whose duty it is to take care of their instruction, there are other powers which by their subtilty may sweep and garnish the mind, and simply prepare the way for feelings and habits of a positively evil tendency. I believe we lose one part of our prospects and chances in dealing with the colourless religion of the day, by thinking that because it is colourless it is therefore powerless. We forget that the soul may become hardened and crystallized against the reception of religious truth, simply by the fact of letting children go, for many years, through a course of teaching which is merely without religion, and fills the mind with other wishes and objects. There is nothing, perhaps, which so gains hold upon the rising powers of the mind of a child beginning to be educated, as that sort of affected superiority to the religious world, which we undoubtedly see prevalent among some of our rising generation who think themselves intellectual. Therefore, I would deprecate this theism being taught in schools as any substitute for religious Education, and implore those of my brethren the Clergy who can, to make use of any other means suggested, and to throw their whole energy into the establishment and improvement of Middle Class Schools at their own venture in direct connection with the Church. Let them not fail to engage the best masters they can, as to ability and conduct: there are many such to be found; and then, if with a brave heart they push forward in the matter, they will find many who will welcome their efforts, who did not know where to send their children before; they will draw into the fold not simply more sheep to be shepherded, but recruits to be trained, and armed, and provided for the great warfare around us; they will bring them into the body of the Church, and make many, who are at present very lukewarm, to be among the best of our defenders. We shall welcome them there, although they may perhaps bring with them very many ideas and projects to which we are averse, and may look perhaps with more practical views than ourselves upon the wants of dioceses, upon capitular powers and revenues, and perhaps on things grown rusty, as they *may* have grown, in our ecclesiastical machinery; but they shall be welcomed, though they may bring in some changes to startle us, provided those changes are such as shall tend to make the Church we love, not simply a costly ornament to the State, but a living power in the nation for the good and the blessing of souls.

The Rev. G. R. Mackarness.

My Lord, Ladies, and Gentlemen,—At this late hour of the evening, and when so much has been said, and well said, on this great and most important subject, I shall not certainly run the risk of even hearing that fatal bell, but shall detain you for a very few moments on the subject which has been alluded to several times to-night, but which, I think, has hardly received that measure of attention which it deserves—I mean the efforts which have been made by that great and good man, Canon Woodard, in this cause. Now I may as well state that I am a humble, a very humble, co-operator with him, and that excellent layman, Sir Percival Heywood, in this work. Therefore I am speaking, it may be said, rather in behalf of what some would call a hobby; but all, I think, will admit, that its place in this great Educational work is so prominent, that a man may be excused if he has a hobby of such a kind. It is universally acknowledged, then, that a great part of the lower middle class, or rather of the class just above the lower middle class, is alienated from the Church. When we say, alienated from the Church, we mean that they have little sympathy with our religious associations, with our Church organization; they may not absolutely be separated from the Church, but they do not feel with us Churchmen on the subject; they treat it rather as a matter of favour, if they belong to any of our institutions or patronize any of our schools. What is the reason of this? I think, if you will trace the history of the nation, you will admit that that part of the middle class of which I am speaking has only fully developed itself within the last fifty years, or at least within the last century. It rose at a time when Puritanism was rampant in the country, and it has inherited a sort of tradition about schools which we must try to root out of it. That kind of tradition is, that there are certain schools for the rich, and certain schools for the poor. I suppose something of this kind, if not expressed in words, lies at the bottom of their feelings. They think it is very right for gentlemen to send their sons to Eton, and Winchester, and so on, to prepare for holy orders and for the army and navy; and that it is all very right for the poorer classes to send their children to the excellent national schools which are provided for them; but they say "It is part of the freedom we inherit from our forefathers to go where we like. We can choose church, or chapel, and are not bound by the old historical or religious associations of the country." There is a sort of freedom in this idea; and I think it is often actually at the bottom of the choice of their schools. Now, I say, we ought to break down that tradition if we can; and how are we to do it? I can see no other means than that adopted by Canon Woodard, viz., by supplying them at once with good schools, which *they can call their own*. He began his system, you remember, at a time when things looked very bad indeed. It was about twenty years ago when he saw a great mass of the young men of London absolutely falling away from the Church of their fathers—scarcely ever going to the services of *any* church. He then began this educational scheme, which has developed into larger proportions than he anticipated, confident as he was; and I say, if all churchmen in England would support that scheme—I would not throw cold water upon other schemes—if we all made one great effort to support Canon Woodard, the desired object would be attained in time. It would bring our middle classes back to the Church, and save them from those two great enemies—Liberalism in politics—I beg pardon,—false Liberalism in politics—and, what is still more important, from Broad principles in theology. Now I said I would not detain you many minutes, and I will only call your attention to what is being done in Staffordshire at the present moment. A school, in connection with St. Nicolas' college, at Denstone, is rising in grand proportions, and is one of the finest and most substantial buildings that I think can be seen anywhere in the midland counties. That school only wants more money to rise to still fairer proportions. I make a suggestion, which may be thought, perhaps, a very simple one—that the way in which every one may help forward the work is by recommending these schools. As I have just stated, many of our brethren in the lower middle classes don't know where to send their children. They are puzzled often to choose a school. Now each one of us here might recommend all his neighbours in the lower middle classes to send their children to these schools; and thus, I think, in a simple, common-place way we might do much to help forward this movement. And in a still more practical way we may help this work forward by giving our money for these schools; and let us all give also our prayers, that this great work, which Canon Woodard has inaugurated, may be carried out, under God's blessing, so as to bring back to the Church of our fathers thousands upon whom she has now no loving hold. Something was said to-day, by one whom I respect most highly, which caused me great pain. Professor Plumptre, in his most able paper, seemed to throw a little doubt on the good of extending these schools, because, while he gave great honour to the founder, he attributed, or seemed to attribute, to them a kind of partisan colour. If it be so, I think it dwells only in the imagination of those who are opposed to Church principles. We all know what a cry was got up against the schools at one time; but the prognostications of those who raised it have not been verified by the result. These are honest schools, devoted to the Church of England; but because Canon Woodard had the courage at that time to establish them as Church of England schools, upon Church of England principles, and put them under the Bishop of the diocese, this outcry was raised. I am sure he wishes less than any man to give a partisan colour to any of the schools connected with St. Nicolas' College.

The CHAIRMAN.

No more gentlemen desiring to speak, I should like to say a few words. We have heard to-night very much what we heard the other day in reference to the other Act which has been forced upon us—the Elementary Education Act; and what I think may be gathered from both discussions, is this—whatever may be the dangers of the Acts, and however much we may dislike many parts of them, they are unmistakeable calls to the Church of England to bestir herself a great deal more in the work of Education. I remember, some years ago, being asked to a friend's christening, where they had the good Dr. Hook, Dean of Chichester, and then Vicar of Leeds. As he was looked upon as the lion of the evening, we were all expecting to hear something great from him. I suppose he was aware of this, and therefore the lion spoke not; but there was one sentence, and one sentence only, which he uttered, and I dare say many of us have thought ever since of the remark he made, which was this, "The Church of England is essentially the Church of the middle classes;" and I understood more about it when I visited Leeds than I ever did before, because I thought very much the reverse, and I was afraid that from past neglect it was very much the reverse; but we must look upon this appeal as a special call to us to do our duty by the middle classes of this country. We must not forget that we are the Church of England, in two senses. First, it is our duty to maintain the doctrine of the Church of England; and therefore I earnestly second what Mr. Ashwell more particularly said to you this evening,—that it is our duty to bestir ourselves in setting up, wherever we can, standard Church Schools, as a means of raising up the others around us. But, in the next place, we must not forget that it is perfectly impossible for us really to claim, as we do claim, to be the true branch of Christ's Church among the people of this land, without remembering that that Church has no power to ignore other Christian bodies in this country, whether we call them Nonconformists or by any other name. Therefore, though we must do what we can to build up Schools according to our own mode of teaching—though we must do what we can to prevent those rate-supported Schools—and to keep Endowed Schools for the middle classes in our own hands—yet, at the same time, I hold we have no right whatever to withdraw, as Mr. Ashwell also so clearly and sensibly put before you, from School Boards when there are School Boards, or to withdraw from committees on which Nonconformists may be placed under the Endowed Schools Act; but to go there, even if we are in a minority. I firmly believe with him that, in the long run, we may get great vantage-ground by so doing; and I also firmly believe that the mere fact of our being compulsorily brought to act with the Nonconformists, will do a great deal of good, and will enable us to do a good to those Nonconformists, which, by abstention from them, we have not hitherto been able to effect.

One word more,—and it is especially to the country parish Clergy. You must not forget, under these two Acts, the use which may be made of the Educational and other Endowments. I know to my cost that an Educational Endowment, by checking all local effort, will often prevent a good School for years. Under these Acts we may utilize them. If we combine together in our country parishes, and are ready with an available scheme for dealing with these small Endowments, we may materially assist the Education of the people, and make the Middle Class School to be in reality the School that stands midway between the Elementary School and the higher Education which prepares for the University. For, by means of these small endowments, we may get scholarships attached to our Elementary Schools, leading from the Elementary School into the Middle-class School, and from the Middle-class School up to the University. And then we should be able to hold out to our people one of the greatest encouragements to Education, by affording a practical proof of its advantage, when scholars, from the lowest class, may raise themselves by means of these utilized endowments out of the low level they are in now to higher ranks in the social scale.

Bishop RYAN then pronounced the blessing, and the meeting was brought to a close.

FRIDAY MORNING, 14th OCTOBER.

The Right Rev. the PRESIDENT took the chair at ten o'clock.

CHRISTIAN UNITY. PART I.—INTRODUCTORY.—REFORMED CHURCHES. — GREEK AND EASTERN CHURCHES.

The Right Hon. EARL NELSON read the following Introductory Paper:—

THERE is a unity, despite our outward divisions, invisible, but nevertheless real, among all true Christians, which, like that unseen communion of the saints on earth with the saints in heaven, is ever present to the all-seeing eye of God, and ever felt as a blessed reality by each true follower of our dear Lord,—felt sufficiently to strengthen him in his earthly warfare, stimulating him to further conquests,—felt sufficiently to quicken him with earnest longing for that blessed rest prepared for him at last, and now shared by his loved ones who have gone before. The ultra-Calvinist testifies to this by acknowledging some to be true Christians notwithstanding their failure in his distinctive shibboleth; while members of the Roman Communion have been known to thank God for the manifest overflowings of His Holy Spirit upon those who are external to their own body.

To this essential Unity, and to the few outward proofs of it, seen in a general teaching of some truths by all, may be attributed the growth of the Church as we witness it, and the success of those desultory efforts, or casual skirmishes with the enemy, which occupy the pause between the great battles which have been, and that greater one which is even now imminent.

But this is not the Unity which ought to satisfy us. It does not fulfil the beautiful imagery of the Psalmist; it does not answer to the full meaning of our Lord's earnest prayer—"that we may be one," as a witness to the world—"that the world may know that Thou hast sent Me." It is not the same with that Unity, in the strength of which the Church has obtained her two great victories—first, against the intellectual heathenism of ancient Rome, and then against the ignorant barbarism which overwhelmed Europe.

We are now on the eve of another contest. A more perfect civilization, based upon and strengthened by that very Christianity which it seeks to ignore, is presenting infidelity in a more subtle form to the Church of these latter days. And surely it behoves us to be well prepared. Already a cry has gone forth; a greater yearning for outward union is apparent now in all parts of Christendom, and the loss of it is acknowledged by all as affording an important vantage ground to our common enemy.

Let us then, with a view to regain this lost blessing, consider how it was lost, and in what this union which we would seek to regain really did consist.

It is clear from history, that the Unity of the undivided Church was not inconsistent with the freedom possessed by different Churches with their different customs and different liturgies, so long as they were united by a general agreement of the whole Church in a simple creed, drawn up in general councils by the representatives of these different Churches.

The pride of human intellect, seeking to define things too mighty for them, and the growing lust after ecclesiastical power which pre-eminently possessed the Roman Church, destroyed the purer and truer Unity of the undivided Church; and in attempting to supplant it by a forced uniformity has given us nothing but continual schisms and divisions in its place.

The charter of this truer Unity is to be found in the canons of the fourth Œcumenical Council, where, after reciting the Nicene Creed as now received by us, with the exception of the "filioque" clause, the Council went on to say, in its formal definition, that "this creed explicitly taught the perfect doctrine concerning Father, Son, and Holy Ghost;" and then decreed "that it was lawful for nobody to propose or to deliver another symbol to any desirous of returning to acknowledge the truth from any heresy whatsoever;" all which, with the Creed, was reaffirmed by the 5th and 6th Councils in succession.

We have here an unrepealed law of the undivided Church, binding, therefore, upon all; which really stamps all who hold the Nicene Creed without the "filioque" clause, as brothers in the faith.

Our thoughts are naturally directed to this canon, because it was avowedly in defending this that the great schism between East and West arose; and thus the Orthodox Eastern Church was the first Protester against the assumptions of the Roman Curia—and this schism was itself the fruit of Rome's unhallowed attempt to supplant the truer Unity by a system of a forced uniformity.

The simple statement of the existence of this law, universally binding, should be in itself a witness to us of many shortcomings. Instead of looking upon those who hold the same faith as brothers in Christ, to be knit together into a more perfect oneness by kindness and love, we are, I fear, the rather given to treat as enemies of the faith those who refuse to be satisfied with our favourite and peculiar rules of practice or of faith. We have all been in this too faithful followers of Rome's system. The same system which tried to compel the Greeks by the power of the temporal arm to a forced uniformity—which, for political reasons, suppressed the Huguenots in France, who were willing to accept the ancient creeds—which afterwards suppressed the liberties of the Gallican and other Churches,—this same system has been accepted by us, and acted upon in the penal laws against our own Nonconformists, and in the narrow-minded dogmatism of our present religious life.

Yet we of the Church of England are bound by all our distinctive principles to stand with the Eastern Church on this unrepealed law; for though, as I have shown above, our practice has been somewhat different, we have ever appealed to the Undivided Church as the charter of our liberties. And while Rome sought, under Jesuit influences, to keep the awakening mind of Europe in stricter fetters, and by fresh dogmas and more stringent means to enforce an outward uniformity, we have hailed the growth of knowledge as a means for maintaining the faith in its original purity, have gloried in the greater freedom it would ensure, and have sought to guide and to sanctify it as the noblest work the Church could be called upon to perform.

And at the present time, when Rome, in accordance with her old policy, is seeking still further to bind the free intellect of Europe, there are many, now in communion with her, who, viewing with us this growth of intellect as the fruit of the Church's past exertions, see with us the greatest danger to the Faith in these restrictions, and long to undertake the more difficult but far nobler work of purifying, by the leavening influences of Christianity, the most intellectual civilization.

Now, just as the position of the Eastern Church points to the old basis of a simple universal creed, so does this movement of men's minds in the different national Churches of Europe point to the reformation of those Churches on the basis of their long-lost liberties, and a way is thus apparent for the restoration of the two conditions of that truer Unity we would seek to regain.

But it will take time and judgment, and earnest prayers for God's assisting grace, to unravel all the evils which the continued all-entangling endeavours after a false Unity have carried in their train.

So long as Rome maintains this system, all union with her is impossible; and the present attitude of the Roman Curia must lead to still further difficulties, unless, under God's good providence, the very extravagance of her demands may call forth those judicious reforms among the Churches now under her rule, on which alone we can fix our hopes. With the Greek Church it is different; for, though she has practices which we must condemn, she is not formally committed to them, neither does she seek to bind them on others as terms of union.

There are some, however, who, in their zeal for a union with the Greek Church, would at once strike out the "filioque" clause in our rendering of the old Nicene symbol; just as others, to win some Protestant Churches, would suppress the confession of faith which bears the honoured name of St. Athanasius. But we must not forget, that we should thereby lose our chance of union with the National Churches of the Continent when they have won back their ancient liberties. It would be wiser, whilst we freely admit to full fellowship all who have the Greek version of the Nicene Creed which does not contain the "filioque" clause, to keep what we hold in common with the Western Churches; for the position in which we stand may be, in God's Providence, of much moment in the re-union of Christendom. But while holding our Creeds entire, I should not hesitate to agree with the Eastern Church in her protest against the mode in which the addition was made, and to repudiate the heresy which they think it may cover, and which neither ourselves nor any of the Western Church ever intended it to convey.

But while we look for union with other Churches, it behoves us to do somewhat to heal our internal divisions. In treating with our Nonconformist brethren, I would explain the creeds rather than do away with them. And in all points, even where they may have gone from the faith, remembering our own share of blame in the matter, I would seek rather for points of agreement than points of difference, and remove offences by a more careful explanation of our formularies, in love trying to convince them where we know them to be mistaken, not doubting that discussion so conducted will, by God's blessing, bear its fitting fruit.

In services, I would try to lead them back to Wesley's rule of taking the Sacraments in Church; ready to give greater liberty to their different forms of worship; not seeking to bind them of necessity to strict uniformity; knowing that it is our duty, as the National Church of this land, whether Established or not, to embrace within our fold all the true Christians of the nation, who, by that unrepealed law of the Universal Church, cannot be cast out from Christ's Body.

But there are some who would point to more vital difficulties apparent even among those who are already united by a common form of devotion. They argue that that outward unity, for which I long, is not to be expected till the Millennium, because there are two classes of minds among men—one of an objective, and the other of a subjective character—which show their great divergence, the one in a love for a pure and simple, the other for an elaborate and ornate ritual, and further, in their greater appreciation of different sides of the same great truths.

The existence of these different characteristics in men and in nations is undeniable, but the answer to this argument is, to my mind, complete; for if these feelings are innate in men, why blame them for finding vent for them, so long as they do not seek by enforced Uniformity laws to press them as terms of union on those who hold different views? While as to doctrinal differences, are there not objective and subjective sides of every truth? So that, with our finite capacities, the only way in which we can hold the deposit of truth pure is by earnestly contending for different parts of it.

Let us then be content to maintain zealously our side of a truth, knowing the Faith would be deficient without such teaching, and feel at the same time thankful to those who contend as earnestly for another side of it: knowing well that the very zeal incident to human strivings would damage the sacred deposit either side without the counterbalancing zeal of the other. But let us urge our different views of these great truths in humility and love, and not in that spirit of pride and dominion which would thrust out all views but our own, to the certain loss of a great part of a truth, while magnifying that side of it which the passing majority of the hour might enable us to enforce.

There is a solvent which would melt away many differences magnified by party striving. Careful explanations, whether between individuals or the representatives of different Churches, from an earnest desire for a common action of defence or aggression, would reveal real agreements much more frequently than is now supposed possible. And taking our stand on the ancient creeds as a secure basis, let us not seek further unnecessarily to dogmatise, but to permit pious opinions and different practices, whether among ourselves or in foreign communions, so long as there is no attempt to force them on those unwilling to receive them, and so long as we are free to maintain our protests in love against those things with which we cannot agree; remembering, with good Bishop Hall, "that peaceable discourse may have much latitude, but matters of faith should have narrow bounds," and praying with him "that if our brains must needs differ, our hearts and tongues may be ever one."

Oh! that pride in our own supposed superiority and the bitterness of party warfare could be replaced by Christian humility and love! Then would our only jealousy be for Christ's honour and the extension of His kingdom; and as the battle waxed longer, the weary combatants, fighting together in the strength of their common Lord, would soon forget all minor differences, and, amidst the joyful alleluias of their completed victory, find themselves indeed and in truth one with each other in Christ Jesus our Lord.

Rev. F. S. May, M.A., Curate of Christ Church, Paddington, read the following Paper :—

A curious instance of the effects of our religious isolation is to be found in the very words by which my paper is designated. By the expression "Reformed Churches" would, on the Continent, be understood only those bodies of Christians in the West who, while severed from Rome since the 16th century, have declined to make the Augustan Confession a clerical standard; those who, on the contrary, have done so, (popularly all called here *Lutherans*) being there distinguished as the only genuine Protestants. Abroad, a Protestant Church is not a Reformed Church, and a Reformed Church is not a Protestant one; and from this ambiguity our own Church, by implication, suffers almost as much in the eyes of the Lutherans, as some say she suffers in the eyes of Rome and Greece by being designated "Protestant." Of course it is in our own Anglican and wider acceptance of the words that I am now to speak of the "Reformed Churches:"* on the one hand I am to *ex*clude all Dissenters from us at home; and on the other to *in*clude all those bodies of Christians abroad consisting of several classes with very serious distinctions, who have been excommunicated by the Latins when professing to hold the same as ever concerning the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation, but to have introduced in other respects a much needed religious Reform.

And I am to consider these Christian bodies with regard to Union—Union, that is, with the Church of England.

Our *existing* relations with the Reformed Churches have for the most part very little of intimacy. Yet there is abundant reason evident at once for wishing that those relations could be improved. The numbers belonging to these Churches; the learning and piety undoubtedly among them; their large share in modern missionary work in our own possessions as elsewhere; the derivation (almost universally) of their Christianity from our own; their inclination to make common cause with us against Romanism;—these immediately occur as motives for such a friendly wish. Indeed it would be unnatural in us to be indifferent to those Christian bodies who shared with ourselves in the same great movement of the 16th century, however we may now differ from each other. The same great movement, I say; for, as Bishop Andrewes affirms against Bellarmine,* "unto the English none other light [then] shone forth than unto the Germans and Dutch, Danes and Swedes, Poles and Hungarians, and all the other nations round about. And that light," he adds, "was not new, but old, chasing away the Romish obscurity which had supervened." It was in accordance with such sentiments that Archbishop Laud prayed on his scaffold for a blessing on the foreign Reformed Churches. And if we look back before his day, we see many of these communities granted the use of our consecrated temples, in some cases in permanence; the Bishop of London consenting to be the visitor of one foreign body here and the superintendent of another; nay more, we find instances of their pastors being admitted into benefices in our own Church without re-ordination, though it was known that no Bishop had ever laid hands on them.† For about eighty years from the beginning of our Reformation, as Hickes admits, our intercourse went as far as all this; why then is it not so now? The truth is, that with us, as with them, the great Reformation was not a single act, but the work of a whole period; it commenced here under Henry VIII., but did not end till 1662 ||; it had first its negative and then its positive stage: accordingly, we learnt by experience, and the new problems which then presented themselves were not settled all at once. To speak of but one of them—omitting here all questions as to doctrine, and taking only a simple one of discipline—I specify the problem,—How to deal with foreign pastors not episcopally ordained?—Such a phenomenon was without a precedent. Never had a branch of the Church Catholic set up or recognised such a ministry; but on the other hand, seldom had Christian countries presented such a spectacle as then, of the bulk of the Laity and numbers of the parish Priesthood concurring in desirable changes in ritual and teaching, in spite of the opposition of their Bishops. Many of the rulers of our own Church declined for a while to disallow the irregular ministries set up abroad by those with whose cause they largely sympathized, regarding those ministries as provisional and temporary, and being reminded by their authors that for centuries it had been argued in the West, by Divines of best repute,§ that Presbyters without a Bishop could ordain in case of necessity. But while afterwards the non-episcopal novelties abroad were continued longer than the alleged necessity, our own Church determined to prohibit any further official allowance of them within her pale. If I may apply St. Paul's words without offence, "them that were without" she left to the judgment of God; but henceforth she forbade that to be done within her which indeed had never been done by her—what she had hitherto not censured but had never sanctioned.

---

* Some persons amongst us have of late scrupled to call by the term Church those of the foreign reformed organizations which are unhappily bereft of Episcopacy; but this scruple is contrary to the consent of our divines, and to the language of official documents. If such scruplers deem the language of our Elizabethan writers valueless for deciding this point, I would refer them to men like Bramhall and Thorndike; especially to the observations of the latter in his "Right of the Church in a Christian State," c. v. § 61. Accordingly in the "Statement published by authority" on occasion of the erection of our Bishopric at Jerusalem, mention was made of "the less perfectly constituted Protestant *Churches* of Europe;" and in the "Act of Uniformity" (14 Car. ii. cap. 4.) we read of "the foreign reformed *Churches*."

Without, however, saying more on that point at present, let me proceed

* See *Appendix.* † See *Appendix.* || See *Appendix.* § See *Appendix.*

at once to some examination of the Reformed Churches as they are, so that we may ascertain how we should stand towards them, and how an improvement on that standing might be rightly effected.

The Reformed Churches may be arranged in five grand classes, each of them including subdivisions—the Scandinavians, the Continental Lutherans, the Unionists, the Ultra-Reformed, and the so-called Moravians. However these differ in discipline or doctrine, I would observe in the first place that they are all Christians, since they all possess the "One Baptism." For I must lay as a foundation that the validity of Baptism does not depend on its being administered by an Episcopal Clergy. This even Rome concedes; this our own Hooker especially maintained; this our chief Ecclesiastical Court has decided. Next, not only are they all thus, in the strict objective sense, Christians, but most of these bodies are still really, according to their doctrinal standards, what they all professed to be at the Reformation, orthodox in the cardinal Catholic verities of the Trinity and the Incarnation. The three Western Creeds are still expressly received by the Scandinavians, by the Continental Lutherans, by most of the Unionists, by a few of the Ultra Reformed; and the Apostles' Creed and the Nicene without *Filioque*, are accepted by the Moravians. On the other hand, among the Unionists in some minor States of Germany, and among most of the Ultra-Reformed, as in Holland, France, and certain cantons of Switzerland, either the binding force of clerical subscription is nullified by the introduction of the clause "*so far as is agreeable to Scripture;*" or, worse still, the Apostles' Creed itself is openly denied to be now authoritative. Here, then, we come on a first grand distinction as regards the question before us. Some of those bodies we must now look on as having fallen from the standing ground they held in their Reformation: with them Rationalism, elsewhere a perjured intruder, is a naturalized citizen; hence with such, were there no other obstacle, all thought of even Church *friendship*, let alone Church *union*, is impossible.

But even in the case of those Reformed Churches which are happily still loyal to the great symbols of orthodoxy, we must carefully inquire, moreover, whether they have committed themselves, nevertheless, to some heretical or gravely erroneous tenet which either is in reality inconsistent with the sense of those symbols, or is at any rate otherwise at variance with the ruled teaching of Catholic Antiquity. For thus, too, we might be precluded, entirely or partly, from communion with some of them.

Examine first, then, the Scandinavians. Of the Augustan confession, which their Clergy sign, I have already spoken in a paper I read at a former Congress at Norwich; and my conviction as to the character of that document is quite unchanged by any criticism I have seen since. Of our great divines a few, like Dr. Jackson, have deemed inaccurate its language on Justifying Faith, and possibly in some other respects; but none have found in it any cause sufficient to make us regard a Church accepting it as pledged thereby to error, sufficient to part us from it at all. Dr. Döllinger himself admits that its chief living expositors in Germany expound it on the point of Justification in a sense which even *he* deems sound; nay, not only a Cassander, but a Bossuet thought it could be harmonized with a moderate Romanism; and Bergerroth affirms that in the Simancas records he found proof that its sanction was at one time offered by even the Roman Court. Thus much may serve to reassure those of us who fear its partaking of Ultra-Reformed extravagances. Others, who may with as little cause dislike some things in it as still too near Rome, are not in our days, I think, so exacting as to deem it therefore any bar to English intercommunion.

Would then that all the German Lutherans also and Unionists received in the same simple straightforward manner this which Bishop Bull called the most noble Confession of all the Reformed Churches.* But while some of the German Unionists—as I have already said—evacuate the force of their subscriptions, some of the Lutherans—in the kingdom of Saxony, for example—subscribe also other formularies, as collected in their *Liber Concordiæ*, the contents of which our divines have found as much of a hindrance to a full understanding with *them*, as anything in the Second Nicene Council or otherwise, to a perfect understanding with the Greeks.

Of the Moravians I regret that I cannot speak positively; but my impression is that they are not pledged more closely to the Augustan Confession than we are, for instance, to our Homilies; but then, unlike those bodies who have let in Rationalism by a universal laxity, *they* have maintained strong guarantees for doctrine in canons and rituals.

Of the Ultra-Reformed bodies in the like respect I shall only observe that, though the erroneous Decrees of Dort and other products of extravagant controversialism are become universally obsolete, what formularies remain have a party tinge, and, in my humble judgment, cannot but remove those who sign them, whether with a *quatenus* or a *quia*, away from immediate efforts for our nearer approach.

Thus hastily must I close my sketch of the Reformed Churches as to *doctrine*; but the data for appreciating their condition, and what should be our relations to them, must include also a view of their *discipline*. Here then I must recur to what I have already touched on by the way, —the status of their ministry. For whatever our private theory as to the value, under certain circumstances, of non-episcopal ordination, the Church of England has—as I said—utterly forbidden, at least since 1662, its official recognition by us.

In regard to the ministry lies almost the sole serious difference between the two portions of the Scandinavian family. To the one belongs the Church of Sweden, with its daughter-church of Finland; to the other belong the Churches of Denmark and Norway. The Swedish Church claims to have preserved in its Episcopate the Apostolic Succession, on grounds which, while not all that might be desired, are yet believed to be sufficient;† and this circumstance, taken in connection with the essential orthodoxy of its teaching, has warranted the recent movement to develope that intercommunion between it and ourselves, which, as it existed before the Reformation, has never quite ceased at any time since. Having specially advocated that movement in the Church Congress at Norwich, I shall not dwell on it now, though much might be added respecting its important progress since then.

---

* See *Appendix*.

† I may be permitted to refer to my own examination of the topic, in the *Colonial Church Chronicle* for 1861, for which I received the thanks of the late Swedish Primate Reuterdal.

But the Church government of the other portion of Scandinavia—Denmark and Norway—while equally Episcopal in form, has a history far less regular. In 1537, the Bishops in Denmark resigned their Sees into the hands of whomsoever the king should appoint, and binding themselves not to *oppose* the Reformation they declined to *head*, were presented by him to cathedral and conventual dignities. Their first successors were consecrated, in this exigency, by a presbyter from Germany, Bugenhagen. It is very possible, however, that some of the ex-Diocesans united in performing subsequent consecrations; or if they did not, it is certain that they passively acquiesced. Hence, then, the status of the Episcopate of Denmark, Norway, and Iceland, is peculiar. Yet its validity has never been denied by our Church; and, among several indications to the contrary, may be mentioned the formal application for ordination in Denmark made by our brethren in the United States in the difficulty of 1792. But it were much to be wished that, whether from Sweden or from some Church of our own tongue, this Bugenhagian Episcopate could be rectified, through a Bishop of indubitable character partaking in its future consecration. I was honoured by the late Bishop of Iceland (Dr. Thorderson) with the conduct of such a project in the case of his purposed coadjutor: but though the King of Denmark, like his daughter the Princess of Wales, was favourable to it, difficulties were made by some persons at Copenhagen which we could not overcome. Enough was done, however, to show that the idea which had prompted those efforts will, in all probability, somehow or other, be eventually realized.

But if we turn from the Scandinavian peninsulas to the Continent proper, we see Lutherans, Unionists, Ultra-Reformed alike destitute of even a shadow of Episcopal continuity in their ministries. This was not, however, in the case of any of them, intentional,* and their Reformers all pleaded necessity for their excuse. But they were carried along by the same notions which were dominant among their Romish adversaries, concerning the capacity of Presbyters to ordain; they were certainly not so diligent in their efforts for Episcopacy as they might have been. Had they tried harder, what was, for instance, to have kept the Reformed in France from regaining Episcopacy, when after the Conference at Poissy they were joined by Coracioli, Bishop of Troyes? and in Germany, the Lutherans and Unionists might have done the like by aid of some one at least of the local Bishops who befriended them—Hermann, Archbishop of Cologne; or Truchsess, Archbishop of the same; or Von Jagau, Bishop of Brandenburg; or others.† Surely for carelessness none of these Continental Churches can be pronounced void of blame, though much more still are those to be censured, who, among the Ultra-Reformed, soon represented as an advantage what had at first been apologized for as a makeshift. All honour, on the contrary, to those on the Continent, who, like Camerarius, Grotius,‡ Leibnitz,

---

* See Palmer "On the Church;" and Marshall's "Episcopal Polity of the Catholic Church," *passim.* More proof remains, as yet uncollected by English writers.

† See a note by Bp. Whittingham, of Maryland, in *his* edition of Palmer "On the Church," vol. i., p. 355.

‡ Grotius wrote:—"Suaderem eis [sc. Remonstrantibus] ut ii χειροθεσίαν sumerent ab Archiepiscopo Hiberno [sc. Bramhall, ut videtur] qui ibi est, et ita ordinati ordinarent deinde pastores cæteros" (Bramhall's Works, L.A.C. Th., vol. iii., p. 583.).

Pfaffius, Speuer, and Jablonsky,* and the late good King of Prussia,† wrote and worked to get back an indubitable Apostolic Succession. Until such efforts are successful our own course is clear; we cannot unite with those bodies, as Church with Church: even the late Dean Goode, with all his concurrence in their ordinations as fully valid, avowed that we can hold brotherly intercourse only in our individual capacity. For my own part—though it may not be necessary to say so, yet I *will* say it to prevent misconception—I think that, though those of the more orthodox Reformed Churches abroad which are bereft of Episcopacy probably possess—besides a valid Sacrament of Baptism—Eucharists also and other ministerial rites, real to their own members so long as recourse to more regular ministrations cannot be had, we, on the contrary, could expect no blessing from going out of our way to communicate with such, unless under the like circumstances—until, I mean, God casts on us such a necessity as is cast already on them.

The practical conclusion I would draw, therefore, with regard to this kind of bodies is, that while we refrain, in loyalty to our own Church, from full communion with them, we should labour with more urgency than ever in beseeching them to remedy that defect. Well would it be if, as Archbishop De Dominis advised,‡ each of them secured the admission into their body of but a single true Bishop, no matter whence; through him,—even if only appointed to be what they call a "Superintendent,"—a regular Mission for their ministry would be gradually and quietly recovered.

Meanwhile, till that much-to-be-desired amendment is effected, our own people visiting, or residing on, the Continent have a double reason for an adequate providing of British Chaplains. Our Bishopric at Gibraltar has furthered the increase of such Clergy in the South of Europe; so will that now designed at Heligoland perform, it is to be hoped, a like benefit for the North, where, in fact, a British See is on several accounts still more to be desired.

One Reformed Church I have reserved, to speak of its polity separately at the last. The Church of the *Moravians*, as they are commonly called in England, though by themselves the Church of the *Unitas Fratrum*, is in one respect an offshoot from the Lutherans and Unionists, in another a descendant of a body in Bohemia, once distinct, but now merged into the Ultra-Reformed there. That Bohemian body possessed an Episcopate, a remnant of which escaped from persecution into Poland and Prussia. Its two last surviving Bishops, in 1735, consecrated to the like office Zinzendorf, the Lusatian noble of well-known religious zeal, who considered that the Protestants around him had, in losing Episcopacy, lost a gift, which, if not necessary, was yet so precious as to warrant his seeking to recover it by even his individual act.§ Thus commenced the separate existence of the so-called Moravians, governed by an Episcopate thus derived, and drawing its members at first chiefly from the less perfectly constituted bodies on the Continent, but subsequently also, and in yet larger numbers, by means of ever-spreading Missions, from the world of heathendom. Distinguished by constant zeal, and resisting the Rationalism which wrought such ravages among others, this Christian community has deservedly excited especial notice in England and America. In the latter country, Bishop Coxe in particular has urged the desirableness of effecting communion with it. Yet, as that prelate has said himself, any present proposal for such communion would be premature. Besides peculiarities ritual and disciplinary, the claim of their Episcopate to Apostolic succession is anything but clear.

---

* Nelson in his "Life of Bishop Bull," speaks of the negotiations in which some of these latter persons were engaged; it would seem that they failed in consequence of an accidental delay of correspondence on the English side.

† There is no doubt, as Bishop Gray of Capetown has observed, that certain peculiar language in the "Jerusalem Bishopric Act" is due to that King's intention to introduce our Episcopacy into Prussia *viâ* Jerusalem.

‡ See Appendix.

§ See De Schweinitz on the "Moravian Episcopate" (reprinted in the *Colonial Church Chronicle* for 1866); also what Thorndike says on the subject (Works: L.A.C. Th., vol. v. pp. 427–429.) The *sources* will be found, partly in Gindely's work on the "Brethren," but most completely in Benham's recent little volume.

The writers of the body in Bohemia from which it was transmitted, asserted that it was derived, in the 15th century, from one Stephen, a Bishop of the Waldenses, to which people it had descended unbroken from the beginning. But it is now, I think, proved that the Waldenses did not have, or claim to have, such an Episcopacy. On the other hand, documents have been recently discovered which represent this Stephen as having been consecrated when reconciled to the Latins by a Bishop in 1434, at the council of Basle. Some of the Utraquist party in Bohemia seem, according to Gindely, to have admitted the validity of the orders thus derived; but the Ultramontanes there did not, and cited Stephen's own dying statement as justifying their refusal.

On the whole, I am led to think that, with the materials at present at our disposal, this question cannot be decided either way. All this trouble would have been saved had Bishop Vergerio's offer to join the old Bohemian Brethren in the 16th century been accepted. But looking at the extent of the present Moravian Missions and their vicinage to ours, and marking moreover that this body has obtained an English Parliamentary recognition as an "Ancient Episcopal Church," we cannot but feel how specially desirable it would be for their Episcopate to be placed on a footing of greater security, and such improvements introduced into their system in other respects as might make our Church see her way quite clear to welcome them to full intercourse. And I think that the friendly feeling towards us, which I myself have perceived now to animate them, is cause for hope that they will listen to such counsels. Only let us make it clear to them, as to every other Reformed Church, that we wish not to press our mere national features on their acceptance, but that we would simply see all our Reformed brethren on the Continent more Catholic; not as though we claimed "dominion over their Faith," but as wishing to be "helpers of their joy;" so that we and they might be made perfect in one Communion, and extend to the whole world the blessing of a still more Primitively modeled, and therefore more edifying, Reformation than has ever yet been effected anywhere.

ARCHDEACON CHURTON, Cleveland, read the following Paper :—

IT is well known that the earliest renewal of intercourse, since the times of the Reformation, between the Church of England and the Eastern Church, is due to the labours of the learned and memorable Cyril Lucar, patriarch successively of Alexandria and of Constantinople, in the first years of the seventeenth century.

We have reason to regret that, among the English travellers of the reigns of King James or Charles the First, or the Englishmen in civil service, who visited the East, or resided in discharge of their public mission at Constantinople, none should have been found able to give us a more full and exact account of Cyril Lucar's life and labours. There was a Sir Cyril Wyche, son of Sir Peter Wyche, British Ambassador to the Porte, who was born and baptized at Constantinople, and received his name from the Patriarch, who undertook to be his godfather. Sir Cyril being alive and known in some public capacity in the reign of Charles the Second, in the year 1674, we find Dr. Thomas Greaves, one of a family of learned Orientalists, writing to the eminently learned Dr. Edw. Pocock, informing him that he had moved in the matter, and wishing Pocock to second his request, that the godson should write the life of his godfather.* It did not, however, take effect; and consequently we have little beyond what was published a few years later by Dr. Thomas Smith, in his "Account of the Greek Church," and afterwards by Dr. Twells in his "Life of Pocock." Their information, however, as far as it goes, may be depended on, as derived from the conversation and papers of Pocock himself, a first-rate authority on Oriental matters, and one who had much personal intercourse with Cyril Lucar.

In the early part of the last century, a learned Dutch pastor, Dr. Aymon, published at The Hague a work with the title of "Authentic Monuments of the Religion of the Greeks;" in which he inserted twenty-seven letters of Cyril Lucar, of which only one or two had been previously made public, written partly in Latin, and partly in the Italian language, and addressed to several distinguished members of the Dutch and other Protestant Churches. The longest and altogether the most interesting is one addressed to John Witenbogaert, the friend of Grotius and Barnevelt, and, like them, a sufferer for his wise and moderate support of the Remonstrant party in Holland; of whose life and trials many particulars are recorded in Gerard Brandt's "History of the Reformation in the Netherlands." The Dutch scholar and poet of that period, Jan Vanderdoes, better known by his Latinized name of Janus Dousa, has a copy of complimentary verses to Witenbogaert, in which he says, that all who had a heart for piety and the love of truth, were under long-lasting obligations to him, but most of all, because it was under his influence that the famous Arminius was appointed to his Professor's Chair at the University of Leyden.

If it was, then, to this patron of Arminius, that Cyril Lucar wrote, and not to the famous opponent of Arminius, Francis Gomar, it seems singular that, in any proper sense of the word, he should have been accused of designing to Calvinize the Eastern Church, over which he presided. In fact, as he himself tells us, his correspondence with Witenbogaert began from a suggestion of the Dutch Ambassador at Constantinople, Cornelius Van Haga, whose acquaintance Cyril had made on his travels many years before, and whom he unexpectedly met again as an old friend, when they were mutually advanced to high places of trust in Church and State. But Cornelius Van Haga was no Calvinist. He was the friend of Witenbogaert: and Witenbogaert's first letter in answer to Cyril, was to send him a copy of Arminius's Theological Disputations.

---

* Twells' "Life of Pocock," p. 297, ed. 1816.

It must be a great question, whether, in his correspondence with distinguished Protestants, Cyril had any other object than to enlarge his own knowledge of Christian learning in the West, and to extend that knowledge among members of his own Church, without at all embracing any Theological System of Western Christendom. He speaks of Calvin in one of his letters, as a holy man; he speaks with much honour of Arminius; and the only point on which he expresses his dissent from Arminius, is not any of those on which Arminius disagreed with Calvin, but that on which the Eastern Church seems to disagree with the Western Church in general,—the article of the Double Procession. Where he seems to glance at the disputes between Calvinists and Arminians, he tells his correspondent that he shrinks from pronouncing any definite sentence; but thinks they might be reconciled, if they would be content to abide by the revealed word of God, without arguing too much about His secret counsels; "dummodo voluerint verbo Dei non abscondito, sed revelato, adhærere." * A wise and moderate expression of opinion, which at least indicates no vehement inclination to any harsh judgment against either party.

It is apparent, that he communicated on subjects relating to the common cause of Christianity with leading persons in every part of Europe, where some sort of a Reformed Church was established: with the Dutch Protestants, and Geneva; but also with the Lutheran Clergy in Sweden,† with their King, Gustavus Adolphus; and, as we know, through the English Ambassadors, Sir Thomas Rowe and Sir Peter Wyche, successively with Archbishop Abbot and Archbishop Laud in our own country.

There remains, it may be said, another basis for the accusation made against him, in the "Confession of Faith," put forth in Greek and Latin in his name, and the strange censures and anathemas pronounced against him by certain Bishops and Ecclesiastical Synods of his own countrymen after his death, when he could no longer defend himself. It is necessary to allude to these proceedings, because they were naturally urged long ago by the Jesuits, by the Latinized Greeks, and learned Roman Controversialists, whose object was to weigh as heavily as they could against the memory of Cyril Lucar. It is necessary also to allude to them, because some among us, who have lately bestowed much excellent and benevolent attention on the affairs of the Greek Church, seem to have attributed too much authority to the censures of

---

* Letter to David Wilhem, ap. Aymon, p. 174.

† Arkenholtz. Mem. de la Reine Christine. i., 486; ii. Append. 113. Mosheim., iv., 402. In the Appendix is a letter of Cyril to Gustavus Adolphus.

those irregular Synods,—more authority than the modern Greek Church itself, if one may judge by the words of its most learned writers, appears at any later period to have allowed.* Having myself examined the acts and decrees of the Synod of Jerusalem or Bethlehem, or whatever else is on record in condemnation of Cyril's Confession, I do not for a moment hesitate to adopt the severe language of Dr. Thomas Smith upon them, that the determinations are "ridiculously idle or scandalously false." † The party zeal and ill-will of the compilers of those censures is conspicuous throughout: they accuse, as heretical in Cyril, propositions which they themselves assert in other terms, or assign to him propositions which he never made. "The bare recital of these fooleries," says Thomas Smith, "is a sufficient refutation of them."

I stand, therefore, on the decision of our forefathers in the Church of England on this question—the decision of Pocock, of Smith, and Basire; and I ask you to distrust the malicious censures, which no combination of names and numbers can make more respectable. That the learned Romanist, Lequien, in his "Oriens Christianus," and the more learned than honest Latinized Greek, Leo Allatius, should have said all that controversial acrimony could dictate against Cyril and his friends, is only too natural; for the great patriarch had effectually spoilt their plot of making the Eastern Church put on the bonds of Rome, and was such an obstacle in their way in the East, as Gustavus Adolphus was about the same time in Northern Germany. For we must remember that this was the age of the Thirty Years' War; when, it is not too much to say, scarcely any contrivance of violence or fraud was deemed unlawful against an adversary of Rome. We may therefore well believe what Cyril himself states in an Italian letter to Antony Leger, a pastor of the church at Geneva, written towards the end of his career, that, when his enemies had prevailed upon the Turkish government to deprive and banish him for a time to the Isle of Rhodes, they had hired a crew of corsairs to board the vessel on its way, to make him a prisoner, and carry him off to end his days at Rome.‡ It was no more than they had done successively to two patriarchs of the Christians of St. Thomas in the East Indies. But a Turkish admiral at sea, who had some regard for Cyril's character, having good information of the design, effectually defeated it.

In his longest letter to Witenbogaert, Cyril had many years before pointed out the prime offence which made up the sum and substance of all the heresies laid to his charge. "When the Greeks," he said, "maintain and prove, that there is not, nor will they allow, in the Church of Rome, any more authority, either by Divine or human laws, than there is in their own patriarchs, and therefore that the Roman is as fallible as they are, a swarm of Jesuits rises up against them, and a certain great critic of their number, one Sanders,"—a name not unknown in our Elizabethan Church History,—"who makes in his 'Chronology,' heaven bless the mark! a long array of the Errors of the

---

* See Theophanes Procopowicz, Tractat. de Process. Spiritus Sancti. Gothæ., 1772.

† T. Smith, on the Greek Church, 1680, p. 279.

‡ See Aymon, Monumens, pp. 78, 79. The Dutch Ambassador, Van Haga, confirms this story. It is quite consistent with the character of Ferdinand II., if we believe what Cyril says, that the agent of this Emperor at Constantinople had a part in this plot.

Greeks: but they all tend to one point; nay, all would be nothing at all if they would only believe in the Pope of Rome, acknowledge him as their superior, and declare him to be Christ's Vicar on earth; as long as they refuse to do this, they are condemned and excommunicated."

It is not the design of this Paper, nor would there be time or space, to enter into any theological examination of the famous Confession of Cyril Lucar. They who find any heterodox teaching in it, may possibly have some uncertain colour of objection; but it is often useful to remember the sagacious remark of Antony Wood: "In the doctrines of Decrees and Grace, when a divine follows the teaching of St. Augustin, those who understand it not call it Calvinism." The English Churchmen of that age, who had most acquaintance with the East, were little disposed to favour either the peculiar doctrine or discipline of Geneva; and they certainly did not find either in Cyril's Confession.

I have incidentally mentioned the name of Dr. Isaac Basire, Archdeacon of Northumberland at the period of the Usurpation—a loyal exile, who, employing the years of his banishment in travelling to Eastern lands, visited Constantinople about fourteen years after the death of Cyril. A very interesting Memoir of this remarkable man was published in 1831, by John Keble's friend and tutor, William Nicholas Darnell, Rector of Stanhope; but, as at that time less attention had been directed to Eastern affairs, the account of Basire's travels in Greece and Palestine, and his intercourse with Eastern bishops and clergy, is somewhat scanty. It is plain that he conversed and corresponded with the friends of Cyril: Paisius, who was then Patriarch, "gave him leave to preach all over Greece," a liberty "which he sometimes made use of both in Constantinople and Achaia."* His mode of making known to the Easterns the doctrine of the Church of England, was by presenting them with a Greek translation for the Greeks, and an Arabic translation for the Syrians, of the Church Catechism. Other interesting particulars of his travels may be gathered from his MSS., of which a good number are preserved in the Cathedral Library at Durham; but, what more immediately concerns the subject of this Paper—Basire brought home with him a well-written copy of the Confession of Cyril, whether in a Greek hand, or copied by a scribe from Western Europe, which, on comparison, I have found to be more correct than the copy printed by Aymon, or that given by Ernest Kimmel, a learned Russian, in a publication entitled "Symbolical Books of the Eastern Church," about twenty-five years since.

One important fact I deduced from this Basire MS. It has been made part of the accusation against Cyril Lucar, that, having drawn up this Confession of Faith, for which he was alone responsible, he gave it the public title of "The Eastern Confession of the Christian Faith," claiming an authority for it which did not belong to it. Even Grotius, who is said to have edited an early edition of it, seems to have joined in this complaint. But in the Basire MS. there is no such title prefixed. And the question is set at rest by a still earlier MS. of the Confession, presented by Dr. Thomas Smith to the Bodleian Library. This MS. is probably in Cyril's own handwriting; at least it is authenticated by his own signature at the end; but the absence of the offending title shows, that the intention of the author was to give an answer to inquirers who might ask what the Greeks believe, but claimed no other credit for it than such as might attach itself to his own name.*

---

* Basire MS., *penes* the Rev. James Raine.

This brief vindication of Cyril's theological consistency, from less favourable opinions lately entertained by some of our friends, prevents me from entering at any length into the particulars of his chequered life; for which inquirers must be referred to the sources already mentioned. There is in the Bodleian a beautiful Arabic MS. of the Pentateuch, presented to that library with other valuable MSS. by Archbishop Laud. It was the gift "of brotherly love," as marked by a brief inscription in his own hand, from the Greek Patriarch to the English Primate, a short time before his death, as Laud himself has noted at the end of the volume, "paulo antequam, octogenarius, Turcarum manibus indigne occubuit." There is something very touching in these two inscriptions in one volume, marking the Christian friendship of one martyr of holy truth and sacred learning for another. But I also notice it as attesting that Cyril, at the time of his death, had attained to four-score years,—a longer term of life than has been assigned him by some of our friends who have lately treated this subject.

He was born in the Island of Crete, probably about the year 1560, or a little earlier, "of most miserable and obscure parentage," says Leo Allatius in bitter scorn. Other accounts contradict this; but, supposing it true, the more to his credit, that his talents and character so effectually prevailed against the adverse circumstances of his birth. But Crete was then under the rule of the Venetians, and something of the arts and learning of old Greece still found protection there. His own cultivated Greek style shows how well he profited by early study of the old masters of his native language, and no less by study of the Greek Fathers. He could also write and converse in Arabic, and, as other educated natives of the Grecian Isles, he became well-acquainted with Latin and Italian, corresponding frequently in either language. Under Venetian protection he went in his early years to Italy, and studied while at the University of Padua. Then we find him an Archimandrite at Alexandria, under the patronage of his friend Meletius, then Patriarch, who was also by birth a Cretan. The Christians of the Greek Communion in Poland being, at the close of the sixteenth century, under persecution from King Sigismund III., who was trying to bring them into the obedience of Rome, by much the same means which Ferdinand II. was employing against the German Protestants, Meletius sent Cyril on a mission for their instruction and defence. This was Cyril's first experience of conflict with the Jesuits and the Church of Rome. Another emissary on the same errand from the patriarch of Constantinople was seized and put to death by Sigismund; and Cyril himself hardly escaped with life. But this bigoted policy ended in the loss of the Ukraine to the kingdom of Poland, the attachment of the Cossacks to the Greeks, to whom they owed their conversion, leading them to secure their religious liberty by becoming subjects of Russia.

Meletius dying about the beginning of the seventeenth century, Cyril succeeded him as Patriarch of Alexandria, where he presided for twenty years. And these were the most peaceable years of his life; during which he began most of his correspondence with eminent leaders of Christian opinion in the northern portions of Europe, and laboured well to improve the state of education and knowledge among his own people. He seems to have travelled in some countries of Germany; but the accounts are not very distinct. He had a valuable library, collecting works of European learning, and Greek and Eastern MSS.; but sensible of the insecurity to which such treasures were exposed amidst the surrounding Turkish barbarism, he took a favourable opportunity to present to our Church and country, not only the Arabic Pentateuch already mentioned, but the best of his collection, the ancient Alexandrine MS. of the New Testament, and the unique text of what was previously unknown to Western Christendom, the Epistle of the earliest of Christian Fathers, St. Clement of Rome. It is well known from the preface of Patrick Junius to the first printed edition of this Epistle, that it was Cyril Lucar's present to King Charles I., made through Sir Thomas Rowe, his ambassador to the Ottoman Court. We may be proud, as a friend of the Greek Church has said, that we now possess these treasures; but our first thought should be one of gratitude to him who entrusted to us the preservation of them for the benefit of Christian learning in all time to come. This was Archbishop Laud's first thought, when he sent to Cyril Lucar one of the first printed copies of St. Clement from the Oxford Press, with a Greek letter of his own;* which, while it gracefully thanks the large-hearted donor of the treasure, breathes much the same spirit which we sought to embody in our Addresses to the Greek Archbishop who visited us last year.

---

* In this view, it stands nearly on the same footing as a composition by a great contemporary of Cyril's in our own country, the "Confession of Faith" by Lord Bacon.

He had been translated from the see of Alexandria to Constantinople in the year 1621. What trials and conflicts he had then to endure to the end of his life, in 1638, may be best learnt from the narrative of Dr. Thomas Smith, to which I have before alluded. He perished, when he was now eighty years of age, by the Turkish bowstring, on a charge of treason to the Great Turk, of having invited the Cossacks to Constantinople, while the Sultan was away on an expedition against the Persians —a charge, which even his implacable enemies hardly deny to have been false and malicious. His body, thrown into the sea, was afterwards washed on shore; and, after some indignities, his remains were at last honourably interred by one of his successors. In the meantime the popular feeling of his countrymen was shown by a concourse of people, who surrounded the house of the patriarch intruded by the Roman faction into his place,—an unworthy man, who was suspected of having been the author of his death. They surrounded his house, and cried aloud, "Tell us, Pilate, where you have bestowed his corpse, that we may come and bury him."

Thus he died; but his work did not altogether perish with him. He was the first pioneer of that revival of intercourse between the Greek and Russian Churches and our own, which, we trust, will now go on and prosper, on those true Catholic principles which alone can sustain it to the end—principles, which no man of that age can be said to have better understood than Cyril Lucar.

---

* See *Appendix.*

There is no time to do more, in concluding this Paper, than just to mention the two younger Greeks, friends and disciples of the great Patriarch, who were for a time students in the University of Oxford, sent by him, or guided by his influence. There is a brief account of both in Antony Wood. The elder, Metrophanes Critopulus, came in the time of Archbishop Abbot, by whom he was sent to Balliol College, where Robert Abbot, the Archbishop's brother, was then Master. He afterwards made some stay, rather to Abbot's discontent, among the German Lutherans at Bremen, at Wittenburg, Strasburg, and Helmstadt; and, returning to the East, became Patriarch of Alexandria after Cyril's translation. Lequien, who seems unwilling to believe that one who had so far fraternized with English or German heretics should have been promoted to this dignity, suggests that it was another of the name who presided at Alexandria; but this conjecture is supported by no proof, and is contrary to the account in Wood, and to Greek and Russian authorities. While at Strasburg, Metrophanes employed himself in compiling a Grammar of Modern Greek;* and, while at Helmstadt, he composed a more important work, which has been associated with the Greek Symbolical Books,—"A Confession of the Catholic and Apostolic Eastern Church." It is a larger and fuller treatise than Cyril Lucar's, and in some points different; but it is the work of a scholar and theologian, written with much discernment of the points of controversy between the Greek Church and other communions.

The younger, Nathanael Conopius, a native, like Cyril, of the Island of Crete, had been the Patriarch's chaplain, or was in near attendance upon him, to the time of his death. At that time of danger, under credentials from the English Ambassador, he fled to England, and sought the protection of Archbishop Laud. By Laud he also was sent to Balliol, the Master of the College being then Dr. Thomas Laurence, the Margaret Professor, and a friend of the Archbishop. Finding this young Greek to be a skilful musician, Laud afterwards procured for him the office of a vicar choral at Christ Church; and he appears to have resided many years in Oxford, till Laud was also called to die a martyr's death, and choirs and cathedral music were suppressed. Among his fellow-students at Balliol was the excellent John Evelyn, who speaks of him as having been the first who brought the practice of drinking coffee into England. The English courtiers under the first Stuarts compared this questionable beverage to the Spartan black broth; and both Evelyn and Wood say that it was not till thirty years later that it became an English custom to drink it. In the times of confusion, Nathanael Conopius returned to the East, and about the year 1651 became Bishop of Smyrna.†

It is plain from these instances, that the education of these Greeks at one of our English Universities was no disrecommendation to them among their own countrymen; and it does much to justify the large-hearted designs of Cyril in all his intercommunion with us. If it is true that what has been in many respects like a University to the

---

* Kimmel. App. Libr. Symb., p. viii.

† Lequien, who has a good deal to say about his friends, the schismatical Roman and Italian Bishops in the East, makes no mention of Conopius.

Greeks, the association of monasteries on Mount Athos, is now threatened with a decline, let us be the more ready to welcome Greek students to our own Universities again.

ADDRESS.

John Pearson, Esq., Q.C, read the following :—

How to secure their own salvation,—how to owe it to the infinite mercy of God, and at the same time to exclude all their neighbours, or the great majority of them, from any chance of sharing it with them, is a problem that has unhappily too often been solved by individuals and societies. Men have found it not difficult to place limits to the mercy of the Almighty, whilst acknowledging that, were it not infinite, they must themselves be condemned.

This has been the story from the beginning of Christianity. It required a vision from heaven to satisfy St. Peter that the Gentiles were to be admitted into the fellowship of the Gospel. Nor afterwards did the Jews of that age readily open their hearts to believe that the exclusiveness of the Jewish religion was to be superseded by a bountiful out-pouring of grace, embracing all tribes and tongues of men. What! were all those ceremonies prescribed with such exactness of detail,—all that ritual ordained amidst the thunders and lightnings of heaven,—all that temple-service elaborated with pious care by kings and priests through many generations, to be cast aside as if they had never been? Was circumcision itself, the seal of the covenant with Abraham, to be abandoned? and that by the followers of Him who proclaimed that He came to fulfil the Law? The Jews might have struggled to allow Christians to be saved through Judaism, but to think of their being saved without submitting to the law of Moses—still more, to think of Judaism as melting away in Christianity,—this was too hard for them. And so there arose contention between Apostles, and opposing teachers, and rival parties; and men, members of one small Church, with all the world against it, stood asunder; the war of shibboleths had begun, and some followed an Apostle, and some this preacher, and others that. Oh for half a page of the lost history of the Church of Corinth! to satisfy those who cast longing looks backwards to the primitive ages, how, even under the leadership of Apostles, the Church was but fighting her way through ignorance and weakness and difference up, to perfect knowledge and strength and unity.

When, for some centuries after this, the Christian Church found itself pitted against the heathenism of the Roman Empire, it is not surprising if the contest gave rise to exclusive tendencies which survived their origin. So gross were the practices then prevalent, so scandalous the vices then common, so utter the profligacy which then pervaded all classes, that those who escaped from them could hardly be blamed if they looked back on the world they had happily left, as John Bunyan's pilgrim did at the City of Destruction; if they saw no escape for their neighbour except by the wicket gate through which they had been led, no hope for his salvation except by perseverance in the same narrow way which they had trod. To learn what they had been taught, to believe what they believed, neither more nor less, was alone safe. And when violence and persecution led to and fostered the monastic life, the habit of limiting salvation necessarily grew upon men. It was natural that those who isolated themselves from their fellows, and added continually to their austere penances, should think nothing right but what they did themselves, and deem that religion little worth which did not bind all its followers to ascetic rules. The ordinary monk, looking through the grating of his cell, could not understand the large life which heaved and surged in the world outside. He saw in it only a seething caldron full of wickedness: he forgot that it was the province of Christianity to sweeten and still its waters; and assigned to religion the task of dissolving all society into establishments of monks and nuns, abruptly cutting asunder all human sympathies, and terminating in the destruction of human succession.

So, again, when the great disruption of Christendom took place at the time of the Reformation, men were too fearfully in earnest to think any good could be found amongst those who differed from them. The ties then severed were too dear, the relationships which were disregarded were too close, the friendships flung aside were too intimate, the passions roused were too deep-seated, the real perils of body and soul which were encountered were too serious for men to dream of any compromise, or to admit that any fragment of the truth for which they contended was possessed by their opponents. Besides, the Reformers needed some apology for their separation from Rome, and Rome required to vindicate herself for her refusal to reform. Each found the excuse wanted in the assertion that they alone possessed a monopoly of the truth and of salvation; and so the door was shut to quiet thought and moderate counsels, and differences were created, then divergent, and destined more widely to diverge, which the lapse of three centuries finds more irreconcileable than they seemed at first to be.

From age to age there has been a repetition of the same story. Men's very earnestness and sincerity have made them exclusive. The difficulty of winning heaven has seemed so great, and the peril of losing it so fearful, that they have not been content to walk along the strait and narrow way without building up stop-gaps and safeguards to strengthen their own virtue, leaving them to cumber the path and prevent others from entering in. System after system has been elaborated, and human inventions have been imposed on men's consciences as equally binding, equally necessary, with the primary truths of the Gospel; and those who did not need them, and could not see the duty or wisdom of submitting themselves to them or of enforcing them on others, have been scornfully cast out. Nor have times of peace and progress induced a larger charity. States have indeed become more tolerant, because there is greater diversity of opinion among those who compose them than there was formerly. Men are more equally divided. Scarcely anywhere are there to be found minorities so small that they can be safely persecuted. But are Churches less exclusive than they were? Are they less eager to shut out those who do not tithe with them the mint and the cummin? Here in England, where every man is free to hold and profess what opinions he pleases, are we larger-minded than we were three hundred, two hundred, or one hundred years ago? Are religious societies among us more tolerant of each other? Time was when the parish churchyard received all who died; Priest and Dissenting Minister, Churchman, Baptist, Wesleyan, and Independent, lay side by side: each having reached the common goal of life, each expecting to meet his neighbour in a better world with all remembrance of past animosities for ever effaced. And from their mouldering graves came a voice, as of earnest remonstrance, beseeching those who survived to abstain from uncharitable divisions and censorious judgments which death at once terminated and rebuked. To-day, our churchyards no longer suffice for our dead, and we supplement them with cemeteries, where the broad road or the iron palisade separates after death those who refused to walk together whilst living, and rival chapels assert the terrible right of Christian men to carry their rancours and jealousies beyond the tomb up to the bar of heaven.

Much of the disunion of Christendom arises from differences on points of order and discipline, not from disagreement on matters of faith. Had Luther and the Continental Reformers retained the Episcopal form of government, how altered would have been the fate and present condition of Europe! But this was not to be. The absence of Episcopal government deprived the Continental Reformed Churches, in the eyes of many, of the very essence of a Church; and so the union between the Protestants of Germany and the Reformed Church of England, originated by the presence of a common danger, came to an end. Yet men would surely have reasoned better if, without abating their love for Episcopacy or their belief in a Divine warrant for it contained in Scripture, they had concluded that there might be Churches,—branches of the one Catholic Church,—not perfect in all their parts, deficient, perhaps, in some excellence of order and discipline, wanting in some of those gifts which the Apostle desired to impart to the Roman Church, but still societies of true Christian men holding in sincerity the great doctrines of our faith as taught by the Apostles and handed down in the Creed which is called by their name, and struggling, however infirmly, after the attainment of more light and greater knowledge. It were surely both our charity and our wisdom not to disown such societies, nor even to treat them with lukewarm confidence, but rather to hold out to them the right hand of fellowship, to walk with them so long as we can, and so to enable ourselves to point out to them a more excellent way. Had this been the view taken and acted on, how changed might the circumstances of the Christian world now be! England and Germany would have been drawn together instead of drifting apart; and in a day of perplexity for the latter like the present, a day in which speculation is rife, and philosophy is prompt to announce her discoveries in religion before they have been proved, England might have been listened to by Germany whilst pleading for the ancient creeds of the Church as a surer anchor of the faith than the cherished hymns of Luther and of Gerhardt.

Another error which has tended to separate Christians has been that which has confounded the rules for Church union with the rules for Church membership. This mistake was pointed out long since by Hooker; but it was too nearly akin to the spirit of exclusiveness already referred to, it was too dear, I suppose, to human nature, not to be persisted in. Each branch of the Catholic Church, considered apart by itself in its separate condition as a society, is entitled to impose what rules it pleases upon admission to itself. It may require subscription to tests, or submission to an examination, or registration, or the payment of dues, or what it pleases, on those who seek to become members of it, and none can claim *membership* but those who conform to those regulations, be they what they may. But as a branch of the one Catholic Apostolic Church it has no right to isolate itself; it cannot with propriety refuse to acknowledge as members with itself of the Church of Christ all men who hold the truth; it cannot deny to them rites or services, which are due not to its own members only, but to all Christian men who seek them. And if it be urged that, without very nice and cautious safeguards, this doctrine would open the way to violations of sacred things which every one would reprobate, I answer that the sin of such violations, if they occur, must lie upon those who unjustifiably invade the Church, not upon the Church which is invaded. The duty of the Church is to dispense with a wide charity the treasures of mercy with which she has been entrusted, not niggard-like to withhold them lest perchance they should reach the unworthy.

Alas for these dissensions which divide Christendom, and the causes of them! Yet is unity promised to the Church of God—not a unity dimly traced and reasonably questioned, but one so clear, so visible to all men, that the world shall accept it as proof of the divine mission of our great Master.—Why tarries the promise? Who has not in early life dreamed of the fulfilment of it, and hoped that our country might have a share in its accomplishment? First, as in the prophetic vision, there came a wind from heaven, and breathed on the dry bones amongst ourselves, until there stood up an exceeding great army; and then these went forth with one heart and mind to reap the heathen fields already white to harvest. And presently, continent and island, hill and valley and plain were thickly sown with tower and spire, and as the sound of mighty waters, came the voice of prayer and praise ascending to Jehovah from many nations in different tongues.

One Faith was there—one liturgy, one white-robed ministry; one Church—the Church of Christ—had filled the world.

But the dream of our youth came to nought—

> ——the man perceived it die away,
> And fade into the light of common day.

Yet stands the promise and shall be performed—but not as we thought, for "God fulfils Himself in many ways."—Not as man schemes, but as God wills. By such agencies as He employs when He refuses to give His honour to another is God bringing about this unity and making the signs of it visibly to appear. Not by the multiplication of creeds and confessions, not by articles and canons, not by Pan-Anglican Synods and Œcumenical councils: by all the circumstances that affect man socially and morally, by his appetites and passions, and the wants they create, by the restlessness that leads him to roam, and the natural affection which makes him yearn for his early home, by health and disease, by the salubrity of this clime and the deadliness of that, by judgments and mercies, by famine in one quarter alleviated by abundance in another, by quiet times and revolutions, by the fall of dynasties and the growth of freedom, by the questionings of philosophy and the answers of experience, by the varied intercourse of peace and the sad severities of war,—God is teaching men that they are all of one family, God is welding men into one vast, peaceful, Christian Brotherhood. The disappearance of vices which before disgraced society, the increase of champions for the right, the decrease of oppressors, the greater value set upon truth and justice, the relaxation of law because self-restraint has superseded it, the abolition of slavery, the conventions for the diminution of the horrors of war, the national outcries for the settlement of national disputes by peaceful courts and not by scientific force and the miseries of human carnage, are certain signs that the leaven of Christianity is leavening the whole world—that the mustard-seed has grown into a great tree and the nations are taking shelter under its branches.

Yes, the unity of the Church is accomplishing itself, and some day we shall wake up to understand in a larger sense than any in which we have yet apprehended it.

"The kingdom of God cometh not with observation" . . . "for, behold, the kingdom of God is within you."

"And all men that see it shall say, This hath God done, for they shall perceive that it is His work."

The Rev. George Williams.

In what I have to say on the subject of the Reunion of Christendom, I shall confine myself to the relations between the Eastern Orthodox Church and our own; and shall ground my remarks on a Treatise which I have lately received from the Metropolitan of Chios, which embodies, as I believe, the sentiments of the most enlightened and liberal members of the Greek Church on the question of intercommunion, and sets forth, in distinct terms, the conditions on which those most favourable to reunion among their divines, are disposed to admit us to a participation in the full rights and privileges of Church-membership. The treatise is entitled "On the Union of All Worships and Churches," and the author is one "Zekos D. Rose, Professor of Theology in the Ecclesiastical Pizareian School, and Vice-President in the National University of Athens." I can notice only such parts of this interesting treatise as have a direct bearing upon my particular subject.

At the conclusion of the second chapter on "The Union of all the Churches," he says, "The commencement of the union of the Churches may have place, even in this present time, through the union of those in England who some time since sought from the Sacred Synod of Russia union with the Orthodox Eastern Church; wherefore we deem it necessary to say a few words on the question, whether the union of those who forwarded this petition is possible, and how it may be effected."

This he proceeds to do in the third and last chapter, in which he makes mention of negotiations some years ago between many eminent Bishops and Clergy of the English Church and the Orthodox Russians, for the union of the two Churches on the terms of Sacramental Intercommunion, without dogmatic agreement! As this is the first I ever heard of such a monstrous proposal, I can only conjecture that the writer has thus strangely misapprehended, and onsequently misrepresented, the negotiations of the Non-jurors with the Orthodox Patriarch of Constantinople, through the medium of the Russian Synod, with which the English Church had nothing whatever to do; except that the Archbishop of Canterbury (Wake) repudiated all complicity with them, and wrote a dignified protest against their schismatical proceedings to the Patriarch Jeremiah.

Dr. Rose then proceeds to notice, first, the proposals of "The Orthodox Catholic Review," edited in English by the renowned German Theologian Overbeck, for "bringing back the English Church to the Orthodox Catholic Church of the West before the schism;" and secondly, the before-mentioned petition of Clergy and Laity to the Russian Synod, circulated in England, he says, a year ago. (The Treatise was published in 1868.) The prayer of the petitioners was, that union might be effected on the condition of their retaining those unessential differences in the Liturgy which existed in the Western Church before the schism, when the Western Church was regarded as a sister of the Eastern. Of this petition I know nothing.

The writer then proceeds in the remainder of his treatise to discuss the possibility of conceding these terms, and the further question of how these Anglicans are to be received—whether by re-baptism, or by the Chrism,—equivalent to Confirmation.

I have thus briefly noticed Dr. Rose's views of the reunion movement in England, in order to show the utter confusion of ideas still prevalent on the subject in the minds of some of the most intelligent and friendly-disposed members of the Orthodox Communion; but chiefly that I may take occasion to dispel, as far as I can in the short time allotted me, the strange illusions to which this writer is a witness.

1. To suppose that Dr. Overbeck and his party in any sense represent the English Church, or that their proceedings can in any way tend to the reunion of Christendom, shows an utterly false appreciation of his position and of the influence which his followers exercise among us. He is, I believe, a convert to the Greek Orthodox Church from the Roman Catholic communion; but in transferring his allegiance from the West to the East, he has unhappily retained all his old prejudices against the Anglican Communion. I know him only from his writings; but it is difficult to imagine language more bitterly hostile to us than that employed in his book. His scheme for opening in London a chapel for the performance of religious services after the Orthodox rite, and for the celebration of the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom in English, with modifications, can only result in a new, and (I venture to predict) not very numerous or influential schism; and if this scheme should unhappily obtain the sanction of the Russian Synod, which has been sought for it, it will constitute an act of ecclesiastical usurpation utterly alien to the unaggressive policy which has hitherto characterized the Orthodox Eastern Church, and must preclude the possibility of friendly relations being maintained between that Church and our own.

2. But although Dr. Rose has missed the mark in treating Dr. Overbeck's party as representatives of the genuine Church of England, yet his mode of dealing with their petition for reunion with the Orthodox Church may be regarded as a fair indication of the line that he would adopt in considering proposals for the restoration of intercommunion between the Anglican and the Eastern Churches. That line seems to me utterly inadmissible; and I am persuaded that unless the two Churches can come together on terms of perfect and entire equality, the reunion can never be effected.

What we ask of the Orthodox Church is this: to examine the claims of the Anglican Church to orthodoxy and apostolicity by the light of history and of her authorized formularies; and if her credentials are found to be satisfactory, to admit her on equal terms to a place in that confederation of free and independent Churches which constitutes the great Christian polity of the one Catholic Church. But then let this investigation be conducted in no narrow, sectarian spirit, but in a spirit worthy of the eminent Fathers of their Church, who in their large charity knew how to temper the most rigid orthodoxy with the fire of Christian love, and had so great a horror of heterodoxy that they hesitated to impute it to any but self-convicted and avowed heretics. Anxious as many of us are to draw nearer to our brethren of the Eastern Churches—impatient as we may be at our long isolation and estrangement from all the other families of Catholic Christendom (*pace* the Common Serjeant)—watching with earnest longing desire for the accomplishment of our Redeemer's purpose and prayer for the visible unity of His elect people, as the evidence to the unbelieving world of His Divine Mission; we are not prepared to repudiate the privileges and blessings of our Christian birthright, received by tradition from our fathers; or to condemn with a retrospective anathema the many generations of our believing ancestors, who have worshipped God in the same formularies, professed their faith in the same creeds, and been initiated and nourished up to Christian manhood by the same sacraments and ordinances as those which are still in use in all Churches of the Anglican obedience, from America to the East Indies, and in the islands of the sea. To conclude with a few illustrations of the principle which I am advocating:—

1. There is that sole point of dogmatic difference in question between us and the Eastern Orthodox Church—the unhappy battle-ground of controversy between the Latin and Greek Churches for so many centuries. It is an historical fact, beyond all controversy, that the doctrine of the Double Procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son, was delivered to the English Church as part of the original deposit by that eminent Oriental Prelate whom we delight to honour as the second founder of our National Church, and to recognise as an early link between our insular communion and the ancient Churches of Asia Minor,—Theodore of Tarsus, Archbishop of Canterbury.

This doctrine, so introduced among us, and constantly repeated in the professions of the early English Bishops on their consecration, has been perpetuated in our Church from that time to this, without detriment to that great Catholic verity of the unity of the Divine Essence, the Monarchia, so jealously guarded by the Greeks, so ably defended by our own divines, especially by the champion of the Nicene Faith, Bishop Bull. If the formal repudiation of the theological errors which the Greeks suspect to underlie the words might avail to remove their scruples, and to vindicate our orthodoxy in the manner suggested by the Royal Commissioners on the Prayer-Book in 1669, the difference would be easily adjusted. But if, as I greatly fear, the exigencies of polemical theology seem to them to demand the unconditional surrender on our part of the obnoxious and avowedly unauthorized interpolation in the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed, as a condition of intercommunion, then, I am persuaded, the spirit of controversy must continue to triumph over the Royal law of Christian love.

2. As we cannot admit that we are justly chargeable with any heterodoxy which can vitiate our baptism, or exclude us from the pale of Catholic orthodoxy, so neither can we allow that the virtue of the Sacrament, as administered among us, is invalidated by any defect of form. Let it be granted, if they will, that trine immersion is not only the most primitive and only canonical form of administering the rite, but that it is also most in accordance with the typical significancy of the Sacrament as expounded by St. Paul; yet, inasmuch as the Greeks themselves admit the validity of clinic baptism, however irregular, they cannot without desecration iterate the rite upon those who have been received into the Church in the manner usually prevalent among us. It is manifest of itself, and will be conceded by them, that our form of Confirmation is both more primitive and more significant than theirs.

3. With regard to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the supposed inefficacy of the form as practised among us, owing to the absence of the invocation of the Holy Spirit on the elements, though maintained by some of the most eminent divines of the East, cannot, I think, prevail against the unquestionable fact that such invocation formed no part of the original institution, and has no place in the Liturgical Offices of by far the greater part of Christendom.

These, then, are some of the points on which we ask from the Easterns a relaxation of the inflexible rigidity of their interpretation of the ancient disciplinary canons, in the interests of unity, without in the least desiring them to conform to our customs or to swerve from such time-honoured, if not primitive practices of their Church "as," to adopt the charitable language of the Preface to our Book of Common Prayer, "they shall think best, to the setting forth of God's honour and glory, and to the reducing of the people to a most perfect and godly living, without error or superstition"—of which, as is there implied, *they*, and not we, are the responsible judges.

Not but that there are certain comparatively recent interpolations in their service-books which I, for one, earnestly desire to see expunged—some vicious excrescences and accretions, or corruptions of ancient practice, which, as their own most pious and best-instructed Doctors will admit, were better reformed. And here is an occasion presented to us for the exercise on our part of that forbearance and toleration which we ask of them. While we require, as an act of justice, as well as of charity, that they will for the future abstain from their old calumnies against us, and put the most favourable construction upon the language of our creeds and other formularies, we must not insist upon importing into their invocations and hymns a vicious sense which they distinctly repudiate and disclaim. We must desist from grounding on our own assumptions and misinterpretations of their language the charges, *e.g.*, of superstition, and idolatry, and creature-worship, often so injuriously brought against them.

The pacification of the Churches, as often of States, is, I am persuaded, only to be effected on the principle of "uti possidetis,"—to borrow the language of diplomacy—*i.e.*, on the understanding that each be permitted to retain what they at present hold. Is it too much to expect that two great branches of the Church, drawn together by so many mutual ties, and by the exigencies of a common danger, in the rising tide of Atheism and Infidelity, should be able and willing to arrange a union on this condition, and so inaugurate that blessed work, for which, in the view of an eminent Roman Catholic writer, this Reformed Anglican Church is the destined Divine instrument and agent— that work for the consummation of which we have been daily offering up our petitions to the Throne of Grace; the reunion of the long-estranged families of universal Christianity in one visible Body—the edification of the scattered fragments of "the Temple of the Living God," into a compact and stately, and world-embracing building; knit together in the fourfold bond of "*Truth* and Peace, of *Faith* and Charity?"

DISCUSSION.

The Right Rev. Bishop Ryan.

I have asked leave to address you for a few minutes, because I feel very strongly that there is needed great caution in proceeding with such matters as those brought before us this morning. I believe some of the greatest mischiefs to the Christian Church arose from the endeavours, early in its history, by converted philosophers, to engraft philosophy, or something additional, into Christianity; and I believe one of the great dangers of the present day, when we are so longing for the conversion of the heathen nations, is, that we endeavour to persuade ourselves that men who talk as favourably as a remarkable Indian gentleman has lately done, are really the friends of Christianity. Now, having been in mission fields and seen a great deal of foreign work, I feel that danger strongly; indeed, my own impression is, that our great duty is to present a positive front to all those Churches of which mention has been made, as well as a positive front to Infidelity and to Atheism. I myself have seen the blessed effects of making the doctrines of the Church of England and her formularies known—of appealing to the Scriptures, and showing that we have the Scriptures on our side, to dissipate the ignorance of those who before differed from us; and I have had the great pleasure of receiving men from all classes of society into the fold of the Church of England, because they had been convinced that ours was the more excellent way. I was struck by the remarks of Mr. Pearson as to the way in which this union was to be brought about. Any Christian man must feel deeply anxious that this union may take place; but I do not believe that it is the duty of the representatives of the Church of England to go and ask any Church under the sun to admit them. We are told, we are to expect and watch for results of travel and other means of intercommunication in the present day, to dispel prejudices against us; and I will give an illustration which I think will commend itself to this audience. When an English Bishop, on his way to a distant Diocese, called on the Coptic Patriarch in Cairo, and mentioned the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Patriarch said he had never heard of an English Bishop; but then corrected himself, and said, he had heard of a Bishop of the name of Mill, who had founded a college in Calcutta. Such ignorance of the outer world can scarcely continue, now that education is reaching the population of that city—in a manner of which I experienced the following illustration. As I was walking with a French chaplain in the square at Cairo three years ago, a boy of about thirteen years of age ran up to me and said, with good English pronunciation, "How are you, sir?" on receiving my reply, he thought a moment and said, "What is the state of your bodily health at present, sir?" and after I had answered his question, and made a similar inquiry respecting himself—I questioned him about the school which he attended, and found that it was a large school set on foot by the Coptic Priests (other educational efforts which are made in Cairo, sufficiently explain the reason of this). I found that he was learning grammar, history, geography, and arithmetic; and I asked him the definition of a noun, which he gave correctly. To the question, "how many kinds of nouns are there?" he answered —"Four," thereby rather perplexing me: but when told to enumerate the four, he did so very readily. "The substantive noun, the adjective noun, the verbal noun, and the participial noun." Examination on other points brought out something of the same results; and we cannot but conclude that if this process goes on for a few years, the Coptic Patriarch will know something of the existence of an Archbishop of Canterbury, and be more accessible to good influences from the Church of England. I think if we only endeavour to retain more and more of the power and simplicity of the Word of God, and depend entirely upon that, and if we ourselves look more than we have ever done to the enlightenment of our own people and to works of charity, we shall have one of the strongest arguments, and bring one of the greatest powers to bear, in commending our invitation to them—not asking them to admit us, but saying to them, "Come thou with us, and we will do thee good."

The Rev. RICHARD WILLIAM RANDALL.

MY LORD,—It is a tremendous responsibility to venture even to speak on such a subject as this, but I feel the difficulty of now speaking upon it even more in my own peculiar case, because really everything which I had intended to say, in the short time during which I shall address you, has been far better said by my friend, who was the reader of the last paper, the Rev. G. Williams. Indeed, I could not venture to follow him, if he had not himself specially requested me to do so. It has occurred to me during this discussion, and I suppose it has occurred to us during other discussions, that there are certain very simple principles which are enunciated by the different speakers, but which fail of being brought home to the hearts of those who meet at such a Congress as this, in consequence of the very eloquence of the speakers who place them before us. They are like jewels whose beauty escapes observation from the very elaboration of the ornament in which they are set and presented to us. Now there are two such special jewels of truth which concern this subject, of which, perhaps, I may be permitted to speak, and they are these—If union between our separated brethren—I ought rather to say, union between our brethren with whom we are not openly and outwardly in communion—is to be brought to pass, it must be by the working into our own hearts and lives of the two great Christian principles of Generosity and Humility.

In saying this, I am seeking to raise the whole of this discussion into a higher sphere. Unity, however it may be promoted by human plans, and by schemes and considerations as to what has seemed to men hitherto to hinder that unity, is at last essentially a Divine work. Man may hew the limbs of his fellow man one from another; but God alone can bring the body when cut asunder, and when even the limbs are reduced to dust, into a new resurrection, and restore to it another life. In this matter, therefore, we must be workers with God; and especially, it seems to me, we should seek from the hand of God these two great graces, which, if I may so say, flow from Christ Himself, as from the fountain from which proceed all the powers and influences that can promote union, and with the help of which alone we can carry on the work of union which is especially His own work. In saying this, you will perceive that I have in my mind what is to me—as I presume it is to you—the moving power in all our thoughts: that our blessed Lord has been pleased not only to impart revelations which proceeded from His own mind, but to add what shows the closeness of His communion with us, and to let us know the thoughts which worked in His own mind, and the feelings which influenced His own heart, and that at a time when such communion is most precious.

There is no such mark of the closeness and intimacy of love, as when the person who loves us admits us to share his anxieties and sorrows, and even to hear his very prayers. And this our blessed Lord has done for us. It was when He was oppressed by the feeling of the great sorrows which weighed upon His heart, that He poured forth that great prayer which is recorded for us in the seventeenth chapter of the Gospel of St. John. On the night before He died when His griefs were accumulating upon Him, He breathed forth that prayer to His Father, which His disciples were privileged to hear—"I pray" "for them which shall believe in Me" "that they all may be one." Let us mount into the shrine of love in that heart, and then we shall best learn how to promote unity.

Now, may I explain what I mean by the expression "Generosity"? I do not mean being uncommonly generous with the truth of God. There is no greater mistake than the notion that, when we are giving up some of those creeds by which God has brought all hearts together, we are approaching nearer to an union of hearts that have been severed. I do not believe we have a right to part with one particle of the Divine truth which has been given to and bestowed upon us by our blessed Lord Himself. The hope of unity does not lie in giving up one particle of that truth which has been delivered to us. The truth was given to the world to bind the world together. It is through our receiving one common revelation that we shall become of one heart and one mind. It was when men continued in the Apostles' doctrine that the multitude was of one heart and of one soul. If our creeds are to be altered,—if people are to be admitted to communion in the Church who do not hold the truth as it has been delivered to the Church,—all hope of unity is lost. What I mean by Generosity is this—that in considering this matter we should look at our Christian brethren in the firm belief that they may have good points in them which we may not possess ourselves. We should feel that charity which thinketh no evil, and rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth. We must be eager, and keen-eyed, and full of the most earnest desire to discover every working of the truth of God and every manifestation of truth in every part of our Lord's Body throughout Christendom. Perhaps we need this.

A friend of mine once said to me (and the sentence struck me very much), that the great thing wanting in the religion of England at the present time is generosity. Thank God, in this Congress we seem to have seen great marks of generosity towards those who differ from each other; and if we have to thank the President for one thing more than another—and we have to thank him for much—I think we have to thank him for that broad spirit of generosity, which, under the help of God, he has so mainly aided to spread amongst us, and especially by his Inaugural Address. Whatever the Congress at Southampton may be remarkable for, at least I think it will be remarkable for the forbearance, tenderness, and thorough spirit of Christian fellowship that has marked those who have met here. Let us extend to those with whom we do not mix, as we do with one another here, that same spirit of generosity in treating this question.

And then, next, we should have a spirit of Humility. And here, again, I do not mean by Humility any slowness to recognise the good points of our own communion. Perhaps there is at present something of an inclination to speak almost sneeringly of what is Anglican. I do not call this Humility. The fullest recognition of all the blessings—of all the *peculiar* blessings, if you will—of all the lights and inspirations which God has especially granted to the English Church, is the greatest moving principle of true humility. I mean, then, by Humility, the being ready to think it really possible that, after all, those blessings may not have been used as they should have been; that there may be faults and failings amongst ourselves in the working of our own communion, which the eyes of those not attached to that communion by the bonds of filial love which bind us to it as sons are bound to a mother, may be more ready to see than we are ready to see them ourselves.

It has been given as one principle of the spiritual life, that if a man wishes to attain to self-knowledge, one of the main things for him to do, is to think what other people say about him; and perhaps, if a Christian communion wishes to be made the means of restoring unity, one of the first things to be thought about is, what the members of other communions would fix upon as the weak points in that communion. What, for instance, must the members of other communions think of some such shortcomings as we have had to discuss in the Congress,—of the masses that are beyond the influence of the Church,—of churches kept closed throughout the week,—of rare celebrations of the Holy Communion,—and of our children growing up without a Christian education in the faith of the Church? If we see and feel these blots on our communion, how much more must they look to strangers?

We must be prepared to act humbly, if we are to work towards the restoration of communion with others, who naturally see more readily than we do any faults and failings which we may exhibit. And above all, it is written, that to the humble God gives grace; and therefore there should be stamped upon the character of English Churchmen a deep sense of their own failings and shortcomings in regard to the blessings which God has showered upon us. And then, as the grace of God is increased in each of us individually, we should have more hope of restoring the outward unity of Christendom. And so, to take up the words of the last speaker, this increase of grace, following upon humility, would tend to that purifying of the whole English Church which may make her shine, as, if she had been true to her privileges, she would have shone long ago, as one in whom God has pre-eminently worked.

The Rev. Canon Fremantle.

As one who some years ago travelled amongst the Oriental Churches and published a little report of their state at that time, I may venture to make one or two remarks with reference to the statements which have been made by former speakers; and one is this, that, while I do most cordially agree that the Oriental Church, and especially the Oriental Greek Church, does possess in her symbols the main principles of divine truth, yet there is another side by which we are to judge of the actual condition of that Church, and of other Churches,—namely, that they have fallen from the faith once delivered to the saints —that, while they do possess the ancient orthodox creeds and formularies, they have admitted changes and innovations to such an extent that they are almost obsolete, and the pulpit is rarely used. It is most grievously to be lamented, that when we visit these people, whether it be the Abyssinian Church, the Coptic Church, the Jacobite Church, the Greek Church, or the Maronite Church, we very rarely find a preaching minister. We do not find the Clergy educated up to the point at which they can give Scriptural instruction to the people. Many of them are scarcely able to read even their own liturgies; and then, when we come to inquire amongst the people for the Word of God, we find they are not in possession of the Scriptures, that they are an uneducated people, and consequently to a great extent—I speak generally, and not uncharitably of any individuals—they are an immoral people. I would ask any one who has travelled among the Orientals in Syria, or in Egypt, or in Greece, whether he will be prepared to say that the population has risen to the standard which he will find in Bible-reading and Bible-taught communities? Well, if that be the case, I would ask this great meeting to bear in mind, that when we go forth as the Church of England to offer to them, as it has been proposed, terms of intercommunion and of union, we must remember that we are a Reformed Church, and that we carry with us the credentials of Reformation, and of our determination to adhere to just principles. We go with the Bible in our hands to invite those people to return to the doctrine and practice of primitive Christianity; and therefore we must be prepared to act out these principles of our Reformation, and not to ask them so much to re-unite with us as to reform themselves. Then I would say, with regard to their declension from primitive truth, I hold it to be a great fact, that just in proportion as Churches, whether in the East or upon the Continent of Europe, have departed from the public reading and preaching of the Word of God, they have fallen into error. And this is remarkably seen in the history of the Vaudois Churches of Italy contrasted with the Churches of the East which have been mentioned. I do not know why one of the former speakers, with the greater part of whose remarks I concur, left out the Vaudois Church from the list of Protestant communions on the Continent. My lord, when you speak to one of the Vaudois, whether in Italy or in the Hautes Alpes of France, and ask if he is a Protestant, he repudiates the term at once, and says, "No, I am a Vaudois, a primitive Christian, I am no Protestant." He has never changed his creed, he has always been what he is; and in this sense we look at these Vaudois as people who, in the terrible persecutions through which they have passed, have lost their organization again and again —they have been deprived of their churches, their ministers, and their ordinances—but they have not lost their Bible. They have retained the Word of God, and with the Word of God they have retained the truth as it is in Jesus. I believe at this moment there is no class of people in the whole world who are more thoroughly united with the Church of England in spirit, in doctrine, and in sympathy, than the Vaudois of Italy and of France. I have lived amongst them and visited them in their wild and almost inaccessible homes among the glaciers of Pelvoux and the rocks of Viso. In one of their villages called Dormillouse there is a population of two hundred in which there has never been a Roman Catholic, and although their privations and poverty are extreme, they are sound in the faith, and maintain the truth once delivered to the saints. They will speak to you upon the great doctrines of Religion with as much intelligence and knowledge of Scripture as the most privileged members of our favoured Church in any parish in England. I would say this: I am no believer myself, as some have said, in the unity of uniformity. I believe in the unity which pervades the whole Church of Christ in its relation to its great Head; and just in proportion as we, individually and collectively, as a church, hold to our dear Lord Jesus Christ, we shall draw others to Him, and in that way promote the unity of Christendom. I believe in the saying of a friend who used to remark, "Dear brother, when we are cold we stand round the fire, and just in proportion as we draw nearer to the fire, we draw nearer together and warm one another. So let us draw close to our dear Head, the Lord Jesus Christ, and as we get close to Him we shall draw others closer to ourselves."

The Rev. Dr. LITTLEDALE.

IN attempting to make a few strictly historical criticisms on some of the remarks of the speakers who have preceded me, I wish to say, in the first place, that the whole question requires to be simplified by stating that the points of difference between various bodies of Christians can be resolved under two heads, discipline and dogma; the former being of comparatively little importance, while the latter is most important. But in respect to even this latter, what should we do? Instead of each assuming that the other, who takes a different side of the same truth, is in dangerous heresy, we should rather offer and invite explanation on points of difference, so as to meet on some common basis. But when I say all those points of discipline which divide us are of comparatively small importance, I must separate from amongst mere points of discipline the whole question of the nature and status of the Christian ministry; because the difference between dogma and discipline is this—dogma comes from direct Divine revelation or logical inferences from such revelation, and discipline from mere human arrangement. But the ministry of Christ's religion, being established by Christ Himself, is not a matter of human arrangement, and is therefore a matter we cannot set aside. Now the teaching of the ancient Church on this head is sufficiently explicit. It draws continually, by the pens of its greatest divines, a sharp contrast between the regularly commissioned ministry of the Church, with its flock of faithful laity, continuing in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and the self-constituted, human, and unauthorized systems of separatist bodies.

It is on such grounds as these that we feel we cannot enter into union with bodies which repudiate the Apostolic ministry. As to the remarks of Mr. May, on the rule as to Episcopal ordinations in the English Church being so late in origin as the year 1662, and there having been no legal obstacle up to that time for an unordained person or persons to hold benefices in the Church of England, Mr. May is historically incorrect. The rule laid down in the rubric of the Ordinal in 1661 upholds the principle thitherto universally maintained; and in the Ordinal of 1552 (that of the Second Book of Edward VI.), when the English Church reached its lowest level of doctrine, there was a rubric substantially identical with the present one, prohibiting any person from ministering in the Church of England who had not received Episcopal ordination. Well, Mr. Lathbury, no doubt a high authority, says it was not an uncommon thing for unordained ministers, or rather ministers of Presbyterian ordination, to hold benefices in the English Church. I have taken a great deal of pains to examine into this matter, and I can find only one clearly proved instance, that of Whittingham as Dean of Durham, against whom a suit was brought to try his right, on the ground that he was incapacitated from lack of Holy

Orders. The suit fell through undecided, owing to Whittingham's death before its close. But the instance is referred to in Burn's "Ecclesiastical Law" as proof that a layman may hold a deanery.

The next point I want to dwell on is this. It has been implied that there is a genuine order of Episcopal ministers in Sweden. Now Sweden, no doubt, retains the title of Episcopacy, as well as the undoubtedly Presbyterian Establishments of Denmark and Norway; but in the absence of any proof of succession we should not be able to admit her claim. The historical peculiarity of the Swedish succession, even as alleged by its advocates, is that it depends on a series of single links, every one of which is at least doubtful. First of all, it depends entirely on the fact of the consecration in Rome of one Peter Manson, or Magnusson, at the request of King Gustaf Wasa. That consecration may or may not have taken place, for there is no documentary evidence forthcoming as yet; but we have one still extant testimony of vital importance, which is a solemn protest, voluntarily made by Peter Manson himself, that every Episcopal act which he had professed to perform, or might afterwards perform, was inherently null and void.

This is bad enough, but it is not all. The succession again depends on one man, Bothvid Sunesson, titular Bishop of Strengnäs, regarding whom there is not only a total absence of proof as to consecration, but a very high degree of probability against it. Once more, the succession hinged on a single prelate, whose name I forget, at the moment;* but of whom I do remember that two out of his three alleged consecrators were only Lutheran Pastors, and the third was a merely titular Bishop.

Further, theologians are agreed that the form of consecration employed in Sweden appears to be absolutely invalid, so that, even had the rebeen competent consecrators at the time of its introduction, its use must have been fatal to any transmission of the Episcopal character.

There are some items of moral evidence also. I was told by one of the first Oriental scholars in Europe—an eminent professor in one of the Swedish Universities, Dr. Tornberg—that if any minister in the Swedish Church chose to return to lay communion, he might do so by notice to the Bishop; but that if he desired afterwards to resume his ministerial functions, it was necessary for him to be re-ordained; whence I argue that the Swedish Establishment looks on ordination as a mere civil and revocable commission.

Another point of evidence in the same direction was lately afforded by the conduct of Mr. Svedberg, Chaplain to the Swedish Embassy in London. He was ill twelve months, and during that time, I learnt a short while ago, he handed over the entire supervision of his flock to a Danish minister, who was necessarily a Presbyterian by ordination. It seems that Mr. Svedberg knew no distinction between his own orders and those of his Presbyterian friend; and as, from his official position, the consent of the home authorities in Church and State must have been needed for such a transfer, we may fairly infer that his view is the authorized Swedish one.

As to what Canon Fremantle said about the Waldenses, I may just observe that the antiquity ascribed to them is simply fabulous. We know their history as well as we do that of the Wesleyan Methodists; and we have historical proof in abundance that they did not spring up till about the year 1170. The way they have got the reputation of such early origin is this:—they have been deliberately confounded, for controversial purposes, with the Albigenses, a depraved Gnostic sect of really high antiquity, but perfectly distinct from the Waldenses. The Waldenses, comparatively harmless and orthodox, had no long pedigree to boast of; the Albigenses had no claim to be considered decent Christians. But by fusing them together, the age of the Albigenses has been attributed to the Waldenses, and the doctrines of the Waldenses to the Albigenses, in the teeth of all history.

---

* It was Laurence Petersson II.

The Right Rev. Bishop McDougall.

My Lord, Ladies, and Gentlemen,—I think the subject on the point of Christian union is confined this morning to the union with foreign Churches; and as I have had something to do with foreign churches in my time, there are one or two points I should like to allude to. In the first place, I am quite sure that there is one means of bringing us together with foreign churches which has not been mentioned this morning, and that is the work of Missions. I have seen quite enough to convince me that there are those working for the salvation of souls in the far-off parts of the world, who, though belonging to other churches, are men of the same faith in the Lord as ourselves. I have met with them, worked with them, received help from them, and given help to them; and I feel that that is one great work which a Board of Missions of our Church, properly constituted, may very much assist in. When I went to Labuan, after my consecration in Calcutta, I met there a body of Roman clergy, under an apostolic prefect, who had arrived and taken possession of the country. The governor laughed at me, and said, "Your ground is pre-occupied." I saw in the harbour there were two schooners, and a brig outside, flying the Pope's flag. The day after I arrived, these Roman Catholic clergy called upon me. I had no difficulty in communicating with and understanding them, having myself spent three years under Roman Catholic clergy, and received some of my early education from them, though not in a religious way. Before that, I was sent to a Greek college at Corfu, and then I was removed to Cephalonia (my father's regiment being ordered there), and sent to a Greek priest to learn Latin and to read the Greek Bible, which is a proof that all the Greek clergymen in those days were not so ignorant as is commonly supposed. I spoke to the apostolic prefect, who was a Spaniard, and had been a sailor, but now had given himself up to missionary work for Christ's sake,—and I said to him, "I have been here so many years; you have just come: you know we are at the same work; we are, though soldiers of a different army, or rather different divisions of the same army, working under one General and one Lord; we have one common work. Let us not interfere with one another." He said, "Well, agreed." We agreed that I should keep to the south-west and to the north-west coast of Borneo, where I had been working for several years, and he should go to the eastward. We worked side by side in harmony all the years I was there; only when I came away the Church of England Mission had succeeded in planting itself permanently, while my friend Don Carlos Quarteron had not succeeded so well with his Mission. A case like this is one in which I think a Board of Missions would be of very great use, in defining spheres of Missionary labour, and preventing difficulties and differences between Missionaries of different Churches and Societies. Let that Board be constituted with all the well-known Bishops of our Church and those Laymen whose praise is throughout the Church—the men whose earnest Christian lives, whose noble gifts, and whose burning zeal so often stir up our hearts to Christian love, and create a yearning for Christian union. This zeal was manifested in the stirring words which we heard from the noble Earl (Nelson) this morning, and for which I thank him. I say, let there be such a Board of Missions constituted as I have shadowed forth; and when Missions are undertaken, let communication be made with the directors of missions in the Roman Church, and the directors of missions in the Greek and Russian Church, as the case may be, and let it be said, "We, who have influence in this country or that, are ready as Christians, and as a Christian Church, to do what we can to work together with you, to Christianize the people in it. Let us do our Master's work together."

There is at this moment in that great country of China a mission, coming down from the north, of the great Eastern Church. We ourselves are working up from the south. We have great influence in the south of China—they in the north. We, I say, are different divisions of the army of the great Lord above. Shall we not take measures together? Shall we not each try not only what we can do in our respective spheres, but, when opportunity occurs, endeavour to sink our differences and unite together in proclaiming the great truths we hold in common? (Here cries of "No! no!" and great interruption.)

My lord, I yield to no man here present in my loyalty to the Church of England, and all that makes her what she is—a true branch of Christ's Church Catholic. I love her; I love her discipline—I wish it were better—but I love her charity most, and her willingness to make sacrifices in the cause of Christian charity. I think in this way we may unite with others, in helping forward the good work of bringing the heathen into the fold of Christ, and, by showing before the great enemy in the heathen world a united front, prove that we can make common cause, and fight together for what we know to be for the salvation of men. I feel quite sure that if we only think over the matter when we say our daily prayers, and acknowledge, when we pray, the responsibility imposed upon us by the words "Thy kingdom come," that we shall feel we have indeed, every one of us, a part and lot in this matter; and not only that, but that He who taught us that prayer, desires that we should make common efforts to assist one another in it. Members of foreign churches, or our own Nonconformist brethren, can surely meet with us on common ground, and we may work together to a great extent; if we do not, we are hindering the great work.

I believe the Church of England may be the unifier and the peace-maker among the different Churches of the world in this great work; and I believe if we take it in hand in Christian love and charity, and work in it with others, not exaggerating our differences while holding fast the truth—all remembering that great command of our Lord, "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature," we shall be blessed in the work. If the Church of England does this, and uses the power God has given her, she will be taking the best means to bring about the unity of Christendom, and to make other Churches,—seeing her energy and zeal for the great cause of the advancement of Christ's kingdom,—ready to admit that we are indeed a true branch of the Catholic Church of Christ,—and then as unifiers and peacemakers, we shall receive the blessing of peacemakers.

The Rev. J. S. JENKINSON, Vicar of Battersea.

MY LORD,—In our juvenile days we may remember reading in old Homer, that age was somewhat respected, and I trust in this 19th century that respect is not lost. On that ground I may have, as I desire to put in, a slight claim to your attention this morning, being advanced, through the mercy of God, several years beyond that time allotted to man —three-score years and ten—and having served in the Church militant not far off from half a century. I therefore humbly claim your attention this morning, and would, if it be the last word that I speak, and the last time that I lift up my voice in public before I go hence and be no more seen, desire to enter my humble protest and dissent in reference to the union of the Eastern Churches with the Church of England. I firmly believe, and I express that belief, that it is impracticable and utterly useless. I desire to call the attention of the meeting to two very credible witnesses—Dr. Tristram, who spoke at the Congress at Liverpool last year, and Dr. Littledale, who also spoke at that Congress, and whom you have had the pleasure of hearing this morning. Dr. Tristram, as you know, has travelled in the East, and he says he was permitted to join in the services of the Greek Church. These are his words—"I assert that union with the Greek Church, as she at present exists, is impracticable and mischievous;" and referring to authorities he says, "The *Helm*, printed at Athens, under the authority of the Patriarch, contains the Apostolic Canons, the Seven General Councils, and many other Commentaries, and is held to be the authority of the Church. Simeon, Archbishop of Thessalonica, is accepted as an authorized exponent on the liturgies and on the doctrines. The doctrines of these works are such that union, if it is to be, must be all on one side." Further on he says, "Her doctrine of transubstantiation is most strongly and grossly stated; nothing can be stronger than the Greek word (*Μετουσίωσις*) which expresses bread worship. She is more exclusive than Rome." Is that as it has been termed just now, "a petty difference" between the Greek Church and ours?

Well, I have given you the deliberate conviction of Dr. Tristram, and I trust you will not say he is wrong when he asserts that union is impracticable. Now we come to the Rev. Dr. Littledale—his words are, "I stand here as one of those who have been pledged for many years to try and bring about a reunion between the Church of England and the Orthodox Church of the East; and I want to give, in a few words, the result of an interview I had with the Archbishop of Belgrade in 1865. I had had interviews with three of the Eastern Patriarchs five years previously, but the Archbishop now told me that the chief objection to reunion in the present state of the English Church in the minds of those who thought with him was, that it was corrupt, and required reform. The reforms which he indicated were these. First of all, he complained that too much interference on the part of the State and Parliament was tolerated by the English Clergy, that they submitted to an Erastian interference which they ought to have resented . . . He urged, as a second point, that there were a great number of things in the Thirty-nine Articles which would require explanation or abolition. He gave that as the opinion of the theologians on his own side. Thirdly, he said the Church of England gave a very uncertain sound on the subject of the Holy Eucharist." "I was prepared," adds Dr. Littledale, "to admit that there was a great deal of unsound teaching in the Church of England on that subject."

Such are the testimonies that I bring before you. I have not much time to make any remarks upon them, but I would say, "How is union with the Eastern Churches and ours practicable?" Shall we allow our Communion service to be altered? Will you give up the blessed doctrine embodied in that service, that when we eat the bread we verily eat the body of our Lord Jesus Christ, but "only after a heavenly and spiritual manner"—viz. "in our hearts by faith"? Will you give up the Thirty-nine Articles? I consider them a noble standard, and a memorial of the sentiments and the Scriptural principles of our martyred reformers. Shall we give up, I was going to say, the name Protestant—Protestantism if you like? Shall we give up that name? Never! never! I recognise it as expressing that which our forefathers have handed down to us, and which has been, thank God, the great glory of our land.

Rev. W. W. Malet.

I FEEL proud of being in the same boat with Lord Nelson, and I look on it as a good omen for "Victory" in the glorious cause of unity, that he has taken up the cause. I think I see real "signs of the times" in its favour—if I may be excused speaking of my own experience—during the late civil war in America. I as an English Clergyman held services by invitation in Wesleyan, Independent, and Anabapfist Chapels where there were no Episcopalian Churches; also among hundreds of wounded of all sects in the Richmond Hospitals. Again, when on a pilgrimage, in 1867, to Rome and Jerusalem expressly "for the reunion of Christendom," His Holiness Pio Nono told me that he longed for unity, and his Secretary told me that his Holiness would make "great concessions" to the Church of England to that end. And when in Jerusalem, through the kindness of Father Luigi the Franciscan monk I was enabled to celebrate our Eucharist in the Chapel of the Ascension on Mount Olivet during Ascension tide—one of the communicants being a Syrian. And after strict examination as to the doctrines of the Church of England—I being in Priest's orders dated 1836—the Armenian Patriarch allowed me at Whitsuntide to do the same in the Chapel of the Holy Spirit in his Convent on Mount Sion. Then I was invited by the Greek Patriarch to be present at the "Holy Mystery" in the church of the Sepulchre, where the Holy Sepulchre is the Altar; and lastly, the Syrian Bishop allowed me actually to assist him in his celebration of the blessed Sacrament in his Church—and thence I obtained the beautiful pattern for their Eucharistic bread which I now use, and the machine for making which is in the Ecclesiastical Exhibition at this Congress. These, I think, are signs of Christian Unity. It was Christian disunion that gave rise to Mohammedanism. May not, under God, Christian reunion be the great means to lift them up from their darkness to the light of the Gospel, when again it can be said "see how these Christians love one another"? And to help on this, I have publicly advocated the establishment of a British Hospice, and English Church Brotherhood in Jerusalem.

The Rev. Chancellor MASSINGBERD.

I SHALL not waste your time in saying that I cannot say many things I should wish to say; but I desire to say this, that having had some concern as a member of Convocation in endeavouring to promote what we call a reunion with the Oriental Communion, I feel it incumbent upon me to endeavour, in as short a space as possible, to say a few words on the subject. I believe that there is in spiritual or religious matters something analogous to what we find in physical matters; so that when any great religious movement is about to arise, it may be observed that it arises at the same time in different quarters, and many minds are stirred towards it in a way we cannot ourselves understand, and which we could not have anticipated; and yet we find it there. It is so in the discoveries of physical science; but there is one ingredient in the question with regard to spiritual matters which does not exist in the other; and that is, we know, or ought to know, that there will be always obstacles which will arise; and we ought to know from what quarter they will come, when we are dealing with any great movement which has a tendency to promote the glory of God and the spreading of the gospel of Christ. We ought not, I say, to be ignorant of those devices by which obstacles are raised, nor of the source from which they spring. They may be fostered in some measure by our own mistakes, or by our own impatience, or in many other ways. And when we notice in the first instance the apparently earnest welcome with which our endeavours were received amongst the Eastern Christians, and when we find now at the present time some obstacles of the gravest kind to have arisen, I think we may venture to consider whether it be not possible that those obstacles are of a kind which arise from that quarter and those causes to which I have referred, and whether we ought not to combine all our efforts to counteract them. My friend Mr. Williams has referred to the reports of some endeavours of Dr. Overbeck to hinder the good work we have in hand by obtaining from the Holy Synod of Russia authority to constitute here in England a schismatical branch of the Oriental communion. I regret to say that this information has been confirmed by an apparently authentic announcement in the journal of the Russo-Greek Church which issues from Paris, called the *Union Chrêtienne* conducted by Doctor Guettée, in which it is stated, as on authority, that such consent has been obtained, not indeed from the Eastern Church itself, but from the "Holy Synod" of Russia, and that Dr. Overbeck comes fully authorized to this country to establish such a separate communion. Nothing, more absolutely destructive of any prospect of intercommunion between our branch of Christ's Holy Catholic Church and the Eastern Christians, could possibly be conceived; and if there should chance to be any—I can hardly conceive it possible—I will say, so ignorant as well as mistaken, amongst the members of our own communion, as to think they could release themselves from any bonds, by which they imagine they are now galled, by joining such a movement as that, I would implore them, if it was the last word I spoke, to hesitate and bethink themselves, and see what a misfortune it would be. It would entirely put an end to any possibility of union between us. One thing more—I am not about to enter on the question of intercommunion; I am about to speak in reference to the remarks of a gentleman whom I am happy to recognise here again, and one who spoke before me. If men would only read the successive reports of Convocation upon the subject, they would see that there was no idea or thought of our giving up one single thing from our Prayer-Book; that we never contemplated giving up one of our Ordinances, any of our Liturgy or Articles; that we have carefully guarded ourselves against proposing any change in our own system; but that what we desire is limited to this, that the different branches of Christ's Church, agreeing in a common faith, should recognise each other as Christians, without requiring on either hand the abandonment of customs to which each has become attached.

Rev. H. B. W. Churton.

If any additional approachings to truth and to practical Christianity are aids to further unity, ought we not, as a Church and as a part of the Church Catholic, to take a lively interest in the recent Reformational measures of the Russo-Greek Church, a Church of nearly seventy millions? And what have these measures been? First,—Preaching, whereas previously only the Liturgy was used. Secondly,—the establishing of Sunday Schools. Thirdly,—the emancipation of two millions of serfs, who are becoming by their own labour *owners* of their cottages and of small portions of land. And, Fourthly,—the Translation, by order of the Holy Synod, of the Four Gospels into Modern Russ, and more recently of the whole of the New Testament, sold at a cheap price, to be within the reach of every emancipated peasant. And by a recent letter from a friend near Moscow, I learn that the Old Testament also is now in course of translation. It is customary, I believe, in the Russian Church, so far as the Decree of the Holy Synod regarding Preaching is now acted up to, always before a sermon to invoke by direct prayer the aid of the Holy Spirit. All these four measures cannot (however as yet imperfectly carried out in some points) be without fruit. The Russo-Greek Church is also awaking afresh to the duty of Missions. Surely such endeavours after self-reformation ought to excite lively sympathy with the Russo-Greek Church in the hearts of all of us who long after more intercommunion as a means to attain a greater measure of unity. Allow me, my Lord, in conclusion, to read a brief extract from the letter addressed this last June to the Archbishop of Canterbury by the Holy Synod of the Greek Church, and signed by Theophilus, Bishop of Athens, and four other Greek Bishops:—

"May the all-blessed Spirit, who from heaven visiteth men, lightening their understanding with Divine light, guiding them into truth, and warming their hearts with mutual love—guide all into concord in Christ and unity of faith; or, if not all, at least the Christians of the Eastern Church and of your own, which, abiding by the enactments of the Apostles and the Holy Synods, neither admit of any absolute, arbitrary, and irresponsible monarchy in the flock of Christ, nor allow the faith to be defined after each man's fancy."

"Saluting both your most reverend Grace and all the right reverend Bishops of your Church with the brotherly salutation in Christ, we beseech God to grant unto you all length of days, health, and prosperity; and unto all the Christ-loving people of England and their rulers, the blessing of salvation."

Rev. E. Forbes, of Paris.

Having resided many years on the Continent of Europe, and specially in the city of Paris, from which I am now one of the many refugees, I feel no small interest in that part of the question which refers to Christian union with the Reformed Churches of the Continent. I believe that the basis of all real union is to be sought for rather in identity of *doctrine* than identity in Church Government and Church Ritual. Where there is a serious diversity of doctrine, whether in adding to, or taking from, the great truths of the gospel, there can be no unity.

This position appears to me clearly supported both by Scripture and the articles of our Church. I find St. Paul guarding the domain of doctrinal truth in words which in our day would be looked upon as most uncharitable,—viz., "Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel to you, let him be accursed." I find the loving John saying, "Whosoever abideth not in the *doctrine* of Christ hath not God; and if there come any unto you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed." Still further, in the history of the seven Churches, their standing or falling did not depend on their form of Christian government—no fault was found with it—but *all turned* on whether *they* "*held fast* Christ's name and did not deny His faith." Wherever there was "one Lord, one faith, one baptism," *there* they never exhorted to keep the unity of spirit in the bonds of peace; and in the large-hearted Peter, the terms of unity were thus defined,—"Grace be with all those who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity and truth."

When we turn to the articles of our Prayer-Book, whilst I do see grave difficulties in the way of seeking for unity with *any Church* or Churches holding doctrines "repugnant to the word of God," which are stigmatized as "blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits"; before we seek for unity in this direction, either those errors must be abandoned, or we must walk over the ashes of our Prayer-Book and our Bible.

I need not say these expressions do not apply to the Reformed Churches of the Continent. I do not find one word in the articles of our Prayer-Book to *unchurch* them. I find the definition of a Church to be "*a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure word of God is preached and the Sacraments are duly administered.*" And still further, "*Every National Church has authority to ordain, change, and abolish* ceremonies or rites of a *Church, ordained only by man's authority.*"

That liberty our own Church claimed and exercised—that liberty she gave to them. And when we come to matters of *far deeper importance*, when we compare the confessions of faith in the Reformed Churches, such as the Scandinavian, the Augsburg, the Helvetic, the Bohemian, we shall find them in marvellous harmony with our own. Still further—when we go back some 300 years, we shall find the greatest divines of our Church writing to such men as Bullinger, Peter Martyr, and Rodolph Gualter, not only in terms of friendship, but in terms which showed they were agreed with them in all the saving vital doctrines of Christianity.

Coming further down the stream of time, I find Archbishop Grindal thus writing to them:—"We most fully agree with your Churches in your confessions of faith." I find Bishop Hall saying, "*There is no difference* in any *essential matters* between the Church of England and her *sisters of the Reformation.*" I find Bishop Davenant going further —"We acknowledge them as brethren in Christ, and profess we have a brotherly and holy communion with them." The great and learned Archbishop Usher used these remarkable words,—"However I must think some of these Churches defective in discipline, yet, to testify my communion with them, I would receive the blessed sacrament at the hands of a Dutch minister in Holland, or a French minister at Charenton."

These fathers of our Church found the elements of Christian union in those Reformed Churches rather than in those of the east or the west. I plead for the same brotherly Christian feeling,—that they be not put out in the cold shade of the uncovenanted mercies of God, but rather that the right hand of Christian fellowship be extended to them. I know that among several of the members of these Churches there is much error, and by none is it more seriously deplored than by the good men in those Churches. I know too there is much life. I know there are men whom I highly honour, such as *Gaussen, D'Aubignè, Grandpierre, Monod, Brosier, Krummacher*, and *Valette.*

True, there are many things in these Churches differing from our own, (and I have never valued our own more highly than since I have been brought in contact with the Reformed Churches of the Continent)—there are many things in which, I say, we differ, and consider them defective, such as *Church government, Church ritual*, and *Church robes*; but when we come to great, vital, saving truths,—not how a man should be habited whilst officiating in the Church below, but how he should be clothed when standing before God in judgment,—whether clothed in his own righteousness or in the righteousness of our Lord Jesus Christ, which is unto and upon all them that believe,—then there is perfect agreement. In the words of a living prelate of our Church, spoken to me many years ago, I fully concur—"I have known," said he, "good men in the church of Prussia, of France, Geneva, Scotland—the Church of England—and between them all, on vital truth, there is scarcely the shadow of a difference; and, my friends, in that day when the scaffolding of time and the scaffolding of Churches shall fall, and a building of God shall stand forth shining with the glories of eternity, when the wheat shall be gathered into God's garner, it shall not be asked what hedges divided it when it *grew* upon earth.

FRIDAY AFTERNOON, 14th OCTOBER.

The Right Rev. the President took the Chair at 2 o'clock.

CHRISTIAN UNITY. PART II.—WHAT PRACTICAL STEPS MAY BE TAKEN TOWARDS THE RE-UNION OF NONCONFORMISTS TO THE CHURCH.

The Rev. P. G. Medd, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of University College, Oxford, Rector of Barnes, read the following Paper:—

The time being limited in which I have to deal with a great and complicated question, I must in advance ask hearers now and readers afterwards, to remember that fact, in view of inevitable shortcomings, both in matter and in style, and of some appearance, possibly, of dogmatism—which I am very far from feeling—arising from the enunciation of opinions and suggestions without the opportunity of stating the grounds on which they rest.

No practical steps of policy towards any great object can have any chance of success, however wisely planned, unless the minds of men in general, especially when large communities have to be dealt with, have been first prepared for action and movement by the diffusion and adoption of right ideas, by the general spread of a favourable and susceptible tone of feeling and sentiment beforehand.

How painfully, for instance, during recently past weeks, have we had to reconcile ourselves to the conviction that no intervention, however kindly meant, of neutrals, however deeply and feelingly interested, can have any effect towards reconciling mutually exasperated combatants until the sentiments of those combatants towards each other shall have undergone a favourable change, which shall dispose them to a calm and reasonable settlement.

So evident does it seem that ideas must always underlie policy,—that feeling must prepare the way for, and supply the motive to action,—that the general tone of men's minds must be favourable before we can proceed to what are commonly understood by *practical steps*, that I shall make no further apology for basing my own contribution to this great subject on this principle. Indeed, I take leave to consider that, in the matter before us, the most really practical of all steps, at least in the beginning, will be those which tend to rectify our fundamental conceptions as to the relations in which we and our Nonconformist brethren in Christ stand to each other, as things are now, and as to our consequent duties towards each other.

I say our Nonconformist "brethren in Christ," for I do not undertake to deal with the general question of the Church's duty towards all who are outside her external pale, but only towards those who are commonly understood by the designation "Orthodox Dissenters;" men who, with whatever drawbacks, and amid whatever deplorable antagonism, still hold the essentials of saving Christian belief,—practically, I may say, the Baptists, the Independents, and the Wesleyans.

1. The first necessary step, then, to the rectification of our fundamental conceptions is *the frank and sincere recognition that these men are our "brethren in Christ." Ce n'est que le premier pas qui coûte.* Once get this really and heartily avowed, and I believe we have taken a larger step towards that blessed consummation which, if we are Christians indeed, we and they alike must most earnestly desire, than any that will have to follow. It must—by God's help it shall—be possible for brethren to live together in the same house.

Of whom does the Catholic Church consist? Does it not consist of the whole body of those who, by whatsoever hands, have been baptized into the Threefold Name? Is not every person who has been validly, albeit irregularly, baptized, and has not afterwards denied the Faith, a member of the great Christian Society, a brother in Christ? Some seem to ignore or even to deny this, practically, if not in words; yet, on the strictest Ecclesiastical principles, it is exactly true. And it is a truth that seems to me to go a very long way indeed. Nay, it is on this very truth that the strength of the Church's position rests. She is the Mother of all the baptized, and as such she claims the dutiful allegiance of them all. Her children they are; her palaces are their natural home by very birthright, though some, with whatever degree of excuse, or with whatever degree of fault of their own or of their predecessors, may have, for a while, forsaken her for homes of their own devising. Let her fulfil more and more a Mother's part, and then, in the exact proportion that she does so, her claim will be allowed.

We shall never clear our ideas on this very fundamental point until we firmly grasp *the all-important distinction between the separated bodies in their corporate aspect, and the individual Christians of whom they are composed.* While we must, on all Scriptural and Catholic grounds, maintain that their societies, their corporate organizations, are merely human, and of human origin, as their names bear witness, and that, in so far as those organizations are separate from, and, within the same local limits, in opposition to, the one historic Church, which in its unbroken continuity of descent is and can be but one, they are contrary to the will and the law of Christ, and in principle wrong; we must yet, on the same grounds, admit that the individual units whereof those separate societies are composed are members and children of the one Church, "bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh," though by inherited position wherein they were born they are become "strangers unto their brethren, and aliens unto their own Mother's children."

It is impossible to enter here into the question of what amount of justification or excuse there may have been, either for the first origination of these separate bodies, out of visible communion with the Catholic Church, or for their continued existence now under altered circumstances. We have to deal, not with the originators, but with the providential inheritors, of a separate position, whom we must regard much more gently and with even larger equitable allowance. To deny that God's blessing has rested and does rest on their honest endeavours to do good and to win souls to Christ, to deny that they have carried the Gospel to whole classes in this country, and still more in America, whom but for them it might never have reached at all, to deny that God's Holy Spirit works among them in the fruitful conversion of souls from the power of Satan unto God, can only be done in sheer ignorance of facts or in sheer and audacious defiance of them.

I am not here to defend or apologise for the spirit that boasts itself of "The Dissidence of Dissent," which plumes itself on separation for separation's sake, and would seem to erect envying and strife into virtues, and call Schism itself a blessing—a spirit from which modern English Nonconformity is, especially in its public manifestations, by no means free. We have not so learned Christ. We must abhor such a spirit, and grieve over it as the very worst product of religious division, a mere glorying in our shame. But have we no need, in our thoughts and speech about Dissent, and in our bearing towards Dissenters, to be on our guard against a sort of Ecclesiastical *Chauvinisme*, the very opposite of that Charity which "vaunteth not itself, and is not puffed up," a sort of implied underlying assumption that our own Church, in her system and practical working, in her Liturgy and Services and ministrations, is the very ideal of perfection, that every possible spiritual blessing is everywhere freely afforded through her agencies to all sorts and conditions of men, and that if any find her not exactly a careful nursing mother to them, the fault must be in themselves? Can any thoughtful or educated English Churchman, however devoted, however sensible of the blessings of which she is the channel to himself, lay for an instant that flattering unction to his soul? Must not any one who knows the past history and present condition, improved and improving though it be, of the Reformed Church of England, admit that the phenomena of English Dissent are not to be wholly ascribed to inevitable and inseparable difficulties, or a mere impracticable untowardness in the nature of things or of other people's tempers, but are largely due, or were in their origin, to blunders of policy, to errors of temper, and to neglect on the Church side, or to the unhappy mixture and entanglement, from the Civil Wars onwards, of politics with religion, and the miserable use, both before and after that period, of secular power—and this on both sides—to crush religious opponents? What was the religious condition of England, and of England's Church, here and in her great American Colonies, when God raised up in her one, who, in view of his work and its results, must be pronounced the greatest man she has yet seen—John Wesley? Why was that work allowed to become external to the Church to which he personally was unswervingly loyal? Might not that vast harvest have been secured to the Church, to the unspeakable advantage of all, had the line taken towards his movement been one of affectionate welcome and encouragement and fatherly direction? Might not the Church have been now in an impregnable position in the hearts and affections of the mass of the people of England, could she only have risen to the occasion, and have supplemented her existing system by that admirable organization which is now, I fear, rapidly hardening into a more marked separation and antagonism?

In view of these considerations, and of the lamentable fact that in our own day there have been those who, untaught by experience, would deal with a great religious movement with a like impolitic narrowness, surely we should not be high-minded but humbled. Does not every separated religious body around us exist in great measure through some neglect or omission on our part? Does not their vitality, in the degree in which they have it, arise from their witness to some neglected element of Catholic Truth or of Catholic Practice? Can we be altogether right in treating them as altogether wrong? Must we not acknowledge that they have had some reason for existing, that even we may have something to learn from them, and may not merely treat them as offenders out of Court?

We must, if we are candid, admit all this; and yet we must assert, what is mere historical fact, that Nonconformist Communities are merely human associations, on whose human origin you can lay your finger with every circumstance of time and place. The distinction between them and the units who compose them, and were providentially born into them, is, I conceive, of vital importance to a right and charitable understanding of the moral and spiritual position of Nonconformist bodies. It furnishes the true key to their history, with all its incidents of more or less rapid rise, progress, change, and decay, after the manner of human societies. It explains the absence of that power of revirescence which is one of the Divine gifts of the One Divine Society.

And yet, though we may have the strongest opinion as to the untenableness of any rival Society's position as a *Society*, we may, and we ought, at the same time to feel the warmest charity towards its members *in their personal aspect.* We may urge with all earnestness that their corporate bodies, however well intended and admirably planned, nay, however largely blest, are not the same thing as the Church of Christ; while we may, and we must, acknowledge them, regarded individually, as Christians, our very brethren indeed in the one Mystical Body of Christ.

Now this is an admission of vast importance. It gives us the true measure of the Church's duty towards Nonconformists, and ought, on all Christian principles, to regulate our habitual feeling towards them.

They are our brethren and we may not answer, "Am I my brother's keeper?" The National Church must, by her very name, have a duty towards all professing Christian people within the realm.

"Can a woman forget her sucking child that she should not have compassion on the son of her womb?" History, alas! answers that she may forget. Yet is there One to whom they may appeal with, "Doubtless Thou art our Father, though Abraham be ignorant of us, and Israel acknowledge us not;" One who forgets not any who, amid whatever mistakes, earnestly seek after Him. Neither may we forget or ignore them if we would roll off from ourselves the reproach of losing those whom He has given us to keep and to train for Him, in fear of His awful question, "Where is the flock that was given thee, thy beautiful flock?" "Ye have scattered my flock, and driven them away, and have not visited them. They have gone from mountain to hill, they have forgotten their place to lie down in."

They may forget us, or they may remember us with hostility, but we may not without sin forget them. We may not return their hostility, nor railing for railing. We must bear with them, even with the ignorant opposition and petty envy and narrowness of their worst specimens, trying to overcome evil with good, not thinking that we confute their claims by ticketing them with a nickname, whether as "Philistines," or otherwise, but taking for our motto, "*Christianus sum, Chris-*

tiani nihil alienum a me puto;" after the example of the supremely Beloved, the measure of whose Divine loving-kindness is, "*Homo sum, humani nihil alienum a Me puto.*"

2. This is our first practical step, and a very long one. Our second is one which follows directly from it. It is *the recognition that to do all that in us lies to heal our home divisions is our very first and foremost duty*—a duty than which none ought to lie nearer to the heart and conscience of the Church and of every one of her members, priest and layman alike, in his work, according to his place and opportunity, for her and for God. From the feeling that we are brethren ought to spring up the desire for Re-union. And the earnest desire, on both besides, for Re-union is the first condition of its accomplishment. Some will say, I know, both among ourselves and among Nonconformists, that the thing is now become impossible. I refuse to believe it, though its realization may need some of the faith that removes mountains. I believe in the mountains, but I also believe in the faith. It may be that envying and strife and divisions, like other works of the flesh, will never cease from among professing Christians; but we cannot part with the hope that a day may arrive when, at least among those who live together in the same place and ought to worship together, they shall no longer run to the height of actual separation and suspension of Communion. We may not, we cannot acquiesce in the paralysing effect of disunion on Christian energy and usefulness, its heartbreaking waste of power that ought to be concentrated against the common enemies, against ignorance and irreligion, against intemperance, pauperism, and crime. We cannot acquiesce in the open triumph it gives to the enemies of the common Faith, its annihilation of that potent argument of unity and love, which our Common Master said should convince the world. No; we cherish the hope that one day this may cease, and that hope gives the spring to active labours for so blessed a consummation.

It is a hope that gathers strength every day, for it is undoubtedly one of the most remarkable features in the religious aspect of things at present, that a longing for Re-union has sprung up very generally and in widely distant portions of the Church; and one cannot help believing that, in one direction at least, there has just been a very considerable clearing of the ground in the fall of the Temporal Papacy. But Re-union must be a Re-union all round: a Re-union not merely with our fellow-believers unhappily separated from us in the great Communions of East and West, but also with our fellow-Christians at our own doors, children, as we must still regard them, of our common Mother.

This generation has been privileged to witness the magnificent spectacle of the political unification of more than one great people; God grant that we in England may see a sight for us more blessed still, a unification, religious and social, of our own beloved country; otherwise, in the unprecedented growth of our numbers, in their accelerating gravitation towards the great centres of population, in the ignorance and irreligion of our large masses, I see a pit before us which the noblest self-devotion may one day be too late to fill.

3. Our *third* practical step, and I make no apology for calling it a practical step, for it is only unbelief that could think it not so, is *Prayer.* If we feel that separated Christians are still our brethren—I mean really

feel and not merely say so, if we earnestly desire Re-union with them, and feel it our first duty to promote it, then, as the foundation of all active steps of policy towards promoting it, we shall certainly pray for it. Happily our Church not only prays for the unity of all Christians—as the whole Catholic Church has ever done—at every Eucharist, but also in her ordinary daily service and in her Litany. There are thousands too of us who daily use for that object a special collect so worded as to include in its intention not only our brethren of Rome and of the East, but also our separated brethren at home. But what I should earnestly desire to see is the general use, by authority, of some specific prayer, such as that, for instance, in our own Accession service, at least at one public service each day. If there be anything concerning which, if we agree to ask it, we may confidently look for an abundant blessing, surely it is this. And some such practice would have the further indirect but very valuable effect of impressing the urgent need of Re-union on the mind and conscience of our people, and so preparing them the more to do their duty in promoting it in other ways.

II. In coming, lastly, to *measures of policy*, I speak with more diffidence and uncertainty, and, within the allotted limits, can hardly do more than indicate them in bare outline.

Their general principle, I take it, should be, speaking, as we may say, abstractedly, that the historic Church of Christ in England, professing, as she does, to be National, should so order herself, her system, and her services, that no orthodox believer, no one who is prepared to profess his acceptance of the faith of the Church as declared in the Nicene Creed, the one Common Creed of universal Christendom, should have any just and sufficient ground, whether speculative or practical, for separating or worshipping apart from her.

Of course there will always be irreconcileables—unreasonable people whom nothing that is not of their own making or choosing will satisfy; men in whom the centrifugal force of Self and the delight of self-assertion have not been overcome by the attraction of Christian Love. We must leave such to the action of God's grace, till they are content to look, not "every man on his own things, but every man also on the things of others." To the voice of our charming they will refuse to listen, charm we never so wisely. But we ought to leave no needless hindrance or stumblingblock in the way of any real disciple of Christ. We ought to be ready to say, "Grace be with all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity." By their baptism and by their faith they are one with us, and ought to find their place, with every reasonable liberty, in our common home.

I say, with every reasonable liberty;—I am far from advocating any the least doctrinal compromise, or any the least surrender of really Catholic Ecclesiastical principle in Church Polity and Constitution. But I believe that differences on such points have had far less, on the whole, to do with English Nonconformity than causes of a lower and more practical kind, such as are more appreciable by, and more operative upon, the ordinary run of mankind.

Among these my own conviction leads me to assign the first place—next after apathy and neglect such as would make the most admirable system worse than ineffectual—to a certain *want of elasticity* which, not wholly through her own fault, has been a prevailing characteristic of the

Reformed Church of England, a want of power and freedom of self-adaptation to different circumstances and to different classes of men. Of all causes of disruption and disunion there is none more effective than the unhappy straining after a Uniformity which is—I had almost said, happily—as unattainable as it is certainly undesirable. To one whose lot it has been to see much of districts where Dissent outnumbers the Church, surpasses it, or rivals it, in influence, in wealth, and almost in social consideration, those words of the Preface to the first English Prayer-Book,—"And whereas heretofore there hath been great diversity . . . . . in Churches within this realm . . . . . now henceforth all the whole realm shall have but one Use"—sound like a knell of doom. *The greatest enemy of Unity is Uniformity.* The attempt to be uniform has been tried, and has failed,—signally failed. An arbitrarily imposed uniformity has succeeded only in creating and nourishing Dissent, and, IF ATTEMPTED TO BE STRICTLY ENFORCED NOW WITHIN THE CHURCH ITSELF, WOULD RESULT IN STILL FURTHER DISRUPTION. Unity of belief and unity of essential organization and government are one thing, and are necessary, and may be maintained. Uniformity of worship is another thing, is not necessary, and never can be maintained. It is in her Public Worship that the Church most sensibly and strikingly manifests herself to her people. And if she does so, as the Church of England has too exclusively done, in one, and one only, stiff stereotyped invariable form, she must inevitably, as in fact she has done, lose her hold upon them. To make absolutely no allowance for the differences in taste and temperament of different classes or of different races, for differences of education and pursuits and social condition,—to insist that impulsive and emotional Celt, cool and sober Saxon, rich and poor, busy and leisurely, educated and illiterate, young and old, shall, at all times, and under all circumstances, if they worship with us at all, worship only and always according to one invariable and, in itself, somewhat monotonous form, and to admit of little or no variation in the outward presentation and rendering of that one invariable form, is not only to repel the outsider altogether, but to put some strain on the forbearance of even the loyal. Given unity of creed and of essential order, given sound, sufficient, and valid forms for Sacramental Ordinances, then what remains—the daily ordinary worship of Prayer and Praise, of Scripture and Sermon (and this is what mainly affects the large masses of our people)—might, surely, well admit of almost infinite variety, according to the varying necessities of time, and place, and occasion, and circumstance. Had this been acted upon from the first, and had a liberty been conceded to the Clergy, not of substitution for, but of addition to our fixed and obligatory services, of *simpler subsidiary services*, at other hours, in other or in the same buildings, subject only to the approval of the Ordinary, I believe that nine-tenths of our present Dissent would never have existed at all.

Not less, perhaps even more, important than this, among practical measures which ought no longer to be delayed, is *the restoration to its due place in the Church Ministry of a real Diaconate.* For another weakness of the Church, another secret of her ill-success has been, and is, her drawing her ministers too exclusively from one class—her failure to interest and engage men of all classes in her direct service in some form or other,—to find within her own borders an outlet and a field for that strong religious earnestness which, in a greater degree, perhaps, in past generations than now, characterized the middle and shopkeeping classes. Those classes have always constituted the main strength of Dissent; for of them the Church has ordinarily failed to lay hold, and that very much because she has never provided for them the ministrations of men who understood their wishes, their prejudices, and their wants, but was ever officially represented to them by men who knew nothing, saw nothing, of them in their own homes, but were separated from them by a social gulf that was practically impassable.

It is here that we have felt, and do feel, so grievously the loss of the Diaconate—almost as great a loss, if anything could be, as the numerical inadequacy of our Episcopate. The services that could be rendered in a town parish by a body of *permanent Deacons*,—I mean men still pursuing their own occupations for a livelihood, drawn from the same classes as now supply many of the Dissenting Preachers,—would be, I believe, inestimable. Many such might be found well worthy, in point of religious and spiritual attainment, of assisting the Parish Priest and his Curates in such a capacity, and able to supply them with a fund of practical experience that might be of priceless value towards the recovery of the classes they now find it most difficult to approach, and towards the prevention of those unhappy mistakes which so often destroy the effect of even the most self-denying zeal. Besides rendering help to over-worked Priests in the regular Church Services, they might with great benefit conduct other services, in Church or elsewhere, of the simpler and more popular kind above suggested.

There might, perhaps, not seldom be found amongst them men whom, after a sufficient trial, a Bishop might be glad to admit to the Priesthood. At any rate we should by such a method probably open a mine which, in connection with an improved system of education throughout the country, furnishing students to the Universities from classes which at present send only too few, might largely reinforce the Ministry with men who would possess a wider experience of English society than many of our Clergy have possessed in time past, and so would enable our Church to be more completely what any Church claiming to be National ought to be,—"all things unto all men" and "servant unto all" that she might "gain the more."

Next to these practical suggestions I would press, did time permit, the further one—that *authoritative explanation* should be given, fully, sufficiently, and ungrudgingly, of all such passages and phrases of the Prayer-Book as experience has shown to be very generally misconstrued.

But, in conclusion, I will only say that, if ever the great ideal of a truly National Church is to be realized, we, its members, each in our little sphere where God has placed us, and our spiritual rulers especially, in their high and solemn responsibility, must cherish larger and braver thoughts than heretofore, must rise to wider aims and higher hopes, must make bolder ventures in the way of necessary change in all the practical departments of Church Work and Life, and not content ourselves with keeping what we find. We must remember that essential unity is often, if not always, accompanied by a superficial diversity. In things which stand on a lower level than the unalterable substance of Revealed Truth and the essential constitution of the Church of Christ, in things which are in themselves variable and may be changed "according to diversity of countries, times, and men's manners," we must not require one Procrustean standard for all minds and tastes. We must bear and forbear, live and let live, doing our own work in our own way without denouncing the way in which others do theirs, but willing to learn of others, and remembering always that of all Schools of Christian Thought it is true, that they are generally right where they affirm, and only wrong where they deny. Above all, we must hate party-spirit as the very bane of Christianity, the flat violation of our one Lord's last injunction that we should love another. Our separate Churchmanships, High, Low, or Broad, must be merged in a still higher Churchmanship which is neither the one nor the other, but all three together—*τετράγωνος ἄνευ ψόγου* —a Churchmanship, not of one, but of three dimensions, not superficial, but solid, broad and deep in base, and then as high as you like, if only its aim is ever towards Heaven, built ever upwards in love for Him Who dwells at God's Right Hand.

Rev. J. C. Ryle, Vicar of Stradbroke, Suffolk, read the following paper:—

The reunion of orthodox Nonconformists to the Church is one of the most important subjects which can occupy the attention of a Congress. The benefits which might accrue to the world at large, if such a reunion could be effected, can hardly be exaggerated. If English Christianity is a power on earth, and has an influence on mankind all over the globe while it is a house divided against itself, who can tell what might be done if we were all of one mind? But is such a reunion practicable, probable, or possible? These are very grave and difficult questions.

On doctrinal points the great majority of Nonconformists differ very little from ourselves. Ask them about any of our first nineteen articles, and you will be surprised to find how few objections they would raise to their contents. In short, if you except modes of public worship and Church government, it is wonderful how much Churchmen and Nonconformists have and hold in common.

With such a condition of things staring us in the face, it certainly does seem lamentable that Churchmen and Dissenters should be for ever divided. With a portentous mass of heathenism, infidelity, and immorality on every side it does seem deplorable that we should be disunited. But what can be done?

The clue to reunion is to be found in one word—that word is *concession*, and concession on the part of the Church of England. The Church must be prepared to make large concessions if she wishes to win back the Nonconformists. We must not only cast longing looks on dissidents, and wish, and sigh, and groan, and pray for union, we must be ready to do something and to act. To expect that English Dissenters will come with cap in hand, and humbly sue for admission into our pale, at the first intimation of our readiness to receive them, is simply absurd. They will never do it; and remembering English Church history, I can neither wonder nor blame them. No; the Church must come forward, make the first move, and declare her willingness to make concessions.

If we are not prepared to do this, it is a mere waste of time to talk of reunion. It is ridiculous to tell a man that we want him to come into our room so long as we keep the door locked and sit still in our armchair; we must get up and unlock the door. We must do the very thing which the Church party at the Savoy Conference most stupidly refused to do,—we must meet our Nonconformist brethren more than half way, and honestly state what concessions we are prepared to make.

Now, what concessions can the Church of England afford? What is the price she can pay for reunion and yet retain her essential characteristics, her Episcopacy, her Liturgy, and her Parochial system? These are wide questions, and will receive widely different answers—"*Quot homines, tot sententiæ.*" To my mind she might concede a great deal and yet lose very little. By consenting to a few sacrifices I believe she might achieve an immense gain. Whether I am right or wrong, I will proceed to explain what I mean.

It will clear the way, save my character, and prevent mistakes, if I state at the outset that there is one concession to which we should never give our consent. We should never give up sound doctrine; we should never concede a jot of God's truth for the sake of comprehension. A comprehensive Church without creeds, confessions, and articles, is a fine thing to talk about. It sounds very liberal, very grand, very charitable; but it lacks vitality, and will never work. If Churchmen can only bring in the Nonconformists by pitching overboard all creeds and articles as useless lumber, and putting to sea without a compass, we had far better go on as we are. The price of such reunion is too heavy; you may buy gold too dear. To turn our poor old Church into a kind of Pantheon, in which every one may believe what he likes, and teach what he likes about the Trinity, the Divinity of Christ, the Scriptures, the atonement, the judgment, heaven and hell,—all this may seem to some a most happy and ingenious device. I for one would contend against it as long as I have breath in my body. A colourless, creedless Church, with only one article,—"Every man is a Christian who is in earnest,"—such a Church is the baseless vision of a dream. After all it would be lost labour to attempt to form it. The best and holiest Nonconformists would never join it. Above all, God would not bless it.

But what are the positive practical steps which might be taken, without sacrifice of principle, in order to facilitate the reunion of Churchmen and Dissenters? I have read with deepest attention the reports of the Convocation on "Christian Reunion;" but I must frankly say they do not seem to me to go far enough. Bear with me while I make a few suggestions which I venture to think deserve consideration.

Mind, I do not say the steps I recommend would meet with any immediate success. Long-standing diseases are not easily cured. But they would put us in the right, and clear our consciences, and prove the sincerity of our desire for reunion.

1. The first practical step toward reunion which I suggest is this:—*The Church should offer increased facilities to Nonconformist Ministers for becoming Clergymen of the Church of England.* Few intelligent persons will think of denying that there are hundreds of Dissenting Ministers who are perfectly fitted by soundness, graces, and gifts, to become Clergymen to-day. There are men among them who would adorn and

strengthen any Church in Christendom. I often feel, "*cum talis sis, utinam noster esses.*" Not a few of these Ministers, I believe, would gladly join our ranks to-morrow if they could, and thankfully say good-bye to the voluntary system. I speak what I know. Yet the obstacles the Church generally thrusts in the face of these men are at present so formidable that they are naturally chilled, disgusted, and repelled. They are generally required to be silent for two years and to cease from their ministry. They are required to ignore their own orders and to be ordained over again. Can any man imagine a better contrived scheme for keeping men away from our fold and perpetuating Nonconformity? The sooner one of these barriers is clean swept away, and the other greatly lowered, the better will be the prospects of reunion.

As to the requirement of a Pythagorean silence for two years, I can see little virtue or sense in it. Of course there may be some very young Nonconformist Ministers to whom it might be a good test of sincerity. But to expect a highly-gifted man, in the prime of life, to abstain from preaching for twenty-four months is, in my humble judgment, preposterous and unreasonable. And when, in addition to himself, the man has often a wife and children to maintain, it is evident that to ask him to leave the pulpit for two years is to ask him to starve.

As to the requirement of entire reordination, I admit that the question involves some difficulties, and that the Episcopal character of our Church must be maintained. Yet I cannot help thinking that some middle course might be found, and that willing minds bent on reunion might devise some way out of the puzzle. A special ordination service, framed to meet the case, and a more private and quiet reception of each individual might help to smooth the path. But one thing is very certain. To expect highly-trained and experienced Nonconformist Ministers to ignore their own ordination entirely, and stand as laymen, side by side with young candidates for Deacons' orders from Oxford and Cambridge, is to expect what you will very rarely get. Human nature will never swallow such a pill; and the most conscientious and high principled Nonconformists would never submit to it. Here, then, at the very outset, there must be concession.

2. The second practical step towards reunion which I suggest is this,—*The Church should make a bold effort to reform the Act of Uniformity.* In saying this, I would not be mistaken. I have not the slightest wish to throw overboard our time-honoured Liturgy, and to hand over our parish church congregations to the uncertainties of extempore prayer. Nothing of the kind. I trust the day will never come when the Church of England shall discard the Liturgy. But this I will say,—that we want more liberty in the use of it. Stringent rubrics and strait-laced rules, which were well suited to the days of the Tudors, when two-thirds of the Clergy were papists at heart, or so ignorant that they could not make a sermon, are not suited to the nineteenth century. They are boys' clothes, of a cramped and curious cut, and a world too tight for the full-grown man of 1870. There are several things in our Prayer-book services which seem innocent to you and me, and never trouble our consciences, and yet raise scruples in the minds of thousands of pious dissenters,—scruples that a strong Church might well afford to consider. I believe that more liberty and elasticity about the rules of our Liturgical worship would go far to win the

hearts of many Nonconformists. Do not misunderstand me. It is not Liturgical revision that I plead for, so much as more liberty and elbow room in the use of the Liturgy.

For instance, I should rejoice to see liberty given to any Clergyman, with the consent of his congregation, to divide and shorten our daily services. Whatever many of us may think, thousands of our countrymen consider them far too long. To say that in every parish, town or country, and in every kind of congregation, educated or uneducated, you ought to have precisely the same length of service, appears to me contrary to common sense.

Again, I should rejoice to see liberty given to every Clergyman, with the consent of his congregation, *to omit the reading of the Athanasian creed.* That famous formulary has never troubled my conscience, and I value it, in its way, very highly. But it certainly gives offence to many English Christians, and the public reading of it in many parishes does no good and much harm.

Again, I should like to see liberty given to every Clergyman, with the consent of his congregation, to shorten and simplify the Burial and Baptismal services. Of the Burial service I will say nothing. The enormous length of the Baptismal service, as it now stands, is an effectual bar to the public use of the sacrament of Baptism in many parishes. The sponsorial questions are extremely disliked. The various explanations of the expression "regenerate," no matter whether they are given by High Churchmen or Low Churchmen, by Broad Churchmen or Moderate Churchmen, by No-party Churchmen or Via-media Churchmen, —all fail to satisfy thousands of inquirers. Liberty to use only such parts of the service as are essential to a valid baptism, of which you have a distinct example in the Private Baptism service, would be a great boon to many minds, and lift many a Nonconformist over a stile.

Liberties like these may seem to some minds dangerous and revolutionary, and liable to abuse. I do not believe it. "Nothing venture, nothing have." I think they would do great good, and could do little or no harm. I would not have them imposed on any Clergyman against his will. I would respect every man's conscience. All I plead for is a reasonable relaxation of existing stringency. Little as the concessions may appear in the eyes of some, I believe they would remove many scruples, and pave the way for the return of many dissenters into the Church of England.

After all, a Church should never forget that freedom is instinctively dear to human nature. We all like to be trusted. A trustful mode of dealing will always do more than an iron network of rules, and laws, and rubrics, and penalties, and barriers, and bounds, and restrictions. The principle of trustfulness is known at Eton and Harrow, at Winchester and Rugby. It is known in every well-ordered family, and every well-governed nation. I long to see the Church of England recognising the principle more thoroughly, and giving her ministers more liberty.

3. The third practical step towards reunion which I suggest is this,—*the Church should devise systematic plans for utilizing the religious zeal of the Laity.* Zeal in religion, no doubt, is a difficult thing to manage, and may easily degenerate into Fanaticism. But zeal, like

steam, is an excellent servant when rightly guided; and a well-organized Church should always find something for zeal to do. In a world like this, nothing great was ever done except by enthusiasts; and it is the part of a wise Church not to snub and stifle enthusiasm, but to handle it discreetly, treat it kindly, direct it into right channels, and give it plenty of employment.

On no point, I must honestly say, has the Church of England failed so completely as on this. Wrapt in her own dignity, and satisfied with her parochial system, and her Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, she has never taken zeal tenderly by the hand, and enlisted its aid in her pale. She has forgotten that an army needs irregular cavalry, as well as artillery, infantry, and engineers. She has rarely smiled on her zealous young men of the middle classes. She has too often frowned and shaken her head at the irregular proceedings of laymen in the upper ranks. Her standing maxim seems to have been that of Talleyrand, "Whatever you do, no zeal." Over and over again she has poured cold water on zeal, pumped on it, kicked it, heaped wet blankets on it, and shut the door in its face. The consequence is that she has manufactured myriads of Nonconformists by her Epicurean indifference, and driven thousands of zealous Christians clean out of her pale. The whole Methodist body at this hour is an illustration of what I mean. With proper management nine-tenths of the Wesleyans would never have left the Church. In fact you might write over the door of two-thirds of the Dissenting chapels in England, "Built because the Church did not know how to utilize religious zeal."

It is high time to try another plan. Scripture warrants it. Bishops, Priests, and Deacons are not the only Church officers I find there. I see mention of evangelists, helps, exhorters, teachers, pastors, governors, as recognised institutions in the New Testament day. Why should not the Church of England try something of the same kind? The very Church of Rome, with all her faults, might teach us a lesson in this matter. As Lord Macaulay tells us, She would have taken by the hand Wesley, and Whitefield, and John Nelson, and Howell Harris, and have given every one of them a name, and a place, and a work to do in her system. Now, why cannot we do the same? Be the cause what it may, there is a desperate lack of inventiveness and adaptation, and a deficiency in the assimilating processes in our ecclesiastical body. I often think, if John Wesley had been Archbishop of Canterbury for a few years, he would have bequeathed to the Church some very useful schemes and planned some admirable machinery. One thing I am certain of,—if we want to win back the Nonconformists, we must learn how to turn to better account the religious zeal of the laity.

Thousands of laymen do not care a straw for sitting in Synods and Conferences, yet feel a burning desire to do good to souls. We ought to meet and satisfy that desire.

4. The last practical step toward reunion which I shall name is a very simple one. *The Church must cultivate habits of kindliness in speech and action towards the Nonconformists.*

Simple as this step may seem, it is of vast importance. So long as human nature is what it is, you may do a great deal by kindness and courtesy. Without them, arguments, and reasoning, and logic, and controversial books, and legislative enactments will go for nothing. It is the soft tongue that breaketh the bone. It was the sun that made the traveller unbutton his coat, and not the east wind. Men are far more easily drawn than driven. This is eminently true of the English Nonconformists. Baxter said, that by the use of a little kindness and tenderness (such as Bishop Reynolds used towards Gurnall of Lavenham) the bulk of ejected ministers in 1662 might easily have been retained in the Church of England.

This is very delicate ground, and I am almost afraid to enter upon it. It is handling Sèvres china, or walking among eggs. But there are a few things I should like to mention.

I doubt the wisdom of using hard language about the Nonconformists, and calling them *schismatics*. Grievous words do no good, and stir up strife. Moreover such language does not come with a good grace from Churchmen. "Schismaticus est qui schisma causat, non qui separat." Would it not be better to remember that a vast proportion of Nonconformity has been caused by our own fault, by the neglect of our own Church?

I doubt the wisdom of turning away completely from Dissenters, and never giving them an opportunity of seeing us. This is one among many reasons why I have always supported the British and Foreign Bible Society, and am not ashamed of attending its meetings. On this point however I suppose I need not dwell. The Dissenters have been lately asked to assist in revising the English version of the Bible; and I therefore take it for granted there can be no great harm in co-operating with Dissenters in printing and circulating it.

Finally, I doubt the wisdom of ignoring the work done by Dissenters. It is easy to say in a hasty off-hand way that they do no good to souls, and are of no use; but it is not wise. Scripture is against us. When Eldad and Medad prophesied in the camp, Joshua said "My lord Moses, forbid them." The words of our Master, about one who cast out devils and yet followed not with the disciples, are weighty and solemn. "Forbid him not; he that is not against us is on our part." Facts are against us. When Christ was preached "from envy and strife," Paul rejoiced. We may not admire the way in which Dissenters do their work; but it is utterly incorrect and ungenerous to say that their work does no good at all. Let us not be ashamed to do them justice and give them the credit they deserve. My belief is, that there are hundreds of neglected parishes in which they have supplied the Church's lack of service and been the means of saving many souls.

Feelings are sensitive things, and he that neglects men's feelings, and trusts only to the effect of reasoning on their intellects, will never do much good in this world. Dissenters have their feelings, and they must be wooed if they are to be won.

I close my paper with a frank confession that I am not very sanguine about the future of this subject. Dr. Chalmers said long ago, that "Established Churches were always in peril of dying of dignity," and that changes are always met with a cautious "*non possumus*." I sadly fear that the difficulties in the way of reunion are at present insuperable. I am afraid the subject is likely to prove a Congress shuttlecock, flying backwards and forwards for years between Congress battledores, and that nothing is likely to come of it. And yet the present state of things is most unsatisfactory. It never can be safe to go on as we do.

To say the truth, the grand difficulty—the lion in the way—is to my mind clear, plain, patent, and unmistakeable. We want more union in our own Church. We are a house divided against itself. We do not approach the subject of reunion with clean hands. We lay ourselves open to the bitter retort, "Physician, heal thyself." The Nonconformists may fairly say, "First settle your own differences among yourselves. What is the Church that you want us to join? Is it a Protestant Church, or is it a semi-Romish Church? Is it the Church of the Reformers? or is it a Church that has left her first love, and has got no distinctive principles at all?"

How we are going to answer these questions, when the Nonconformists ask them, I for one do not at present know. But this I do know; they must be answered, if we expect any reunion of Dissenters to the Church of England.

We are very ignorant of the future. It may be, that God has better things in store for us. It may be, that by harder work, and more fervent prayer, and more diligent study of Scripture, Churchmen may be brought nearer to one another. It may be, that by conference and talking matters quietly over among leaders of opinion we may learn to understand one another better. It may be, that by careful definition of theological terms we may discover some "eirenica" for the Church's wounds. At present, I must candidly say, we seem at a dead lock; and unless we can heal our divisions, we are not likely to win back Nonconformists, or lessen Nonconformity.

In the meantime there is one point upon which I think we shall all be agreed. Let us pray for more unity. Let us resolve to use very often that beautiful prayer for unity which is one of the gems of our Liturgy. Let us ask Him who can make men to be of one mind, to heal our unhappy divisions, to pour out the Holy Spirit on us, and to make English Christians of one heart and one mind.

Rev. J. Moorhouse, M.A., Vicar of Paddington, read the following paper:—

That the present is not an unfavourable time for the temperate consideration of the question of reunion amongst Protestant Christians in these islands, there are many significant signs.

I would point—amongst other hopeful signs in the religious life and practice of English Nonconformists—to the wider culture and more Catholic teaching of their leading ministers; to the considerable modifications which are apparent in the worship of their town congregations; and more especially to the courtesy, candour, and moderation of certain of their recent criticisms upon the position, doctrines, and discipline of the Church of England.

Many of the members of this Congress must have read with hope and interest a volume of essays by Nonconformist ministers entitled "Ecclesia." Those of them who have, will, I am sure, forgive me for making one or two extracts from that volume, which will point and illustrate my meaning.

What can exhibit greater candour and fairness than the following admission of Dr. Stoughton respecting certain dangerous tendencies of modern Independency?

"I am quite sure," he observes ("Ecclesia," p. 44), "from long experience, with considerable opportunities for observation, that unchecked divisibility is working disastrously to the interests of religion. It creates rivalries. It promotes alienation. It entails feebleness. It occasions the impoverishment of pastors. It wastes time and strength which, husbanded and employed in a large society, might secure results the most beneficial. . . . Isolation, sectarianism, and schism are evils. That Independency alone, unguarded by other considerations which are as Divine as itself, has a tendency to produce such evils, none will deny."

The honesty that could address such words as these to a community of Nonconformists is capable of great things. Not less courageous and admirable is the large-hearted charity which breathes in such words as the following, taken from another essay in the same book (p. 417)—"There is a truth in the gorgeous cathedral, the decorated church, the sumptuous service, and in the adventitious sentiment of the Christian Year." And again (p. 433), "Some few of the songs of the Church, such as the 'Gloria in Excelsis,' the 'Te Deum,' and others of later days, are so felicitous and Catholic—they deal with such universal truths and experiences, and deal with them so grandly,—that they are hymns for all time, and bear transference into all languages."

But a little more on our part of the like honest confession of shortcoming, of the like generous appreciation of excellence in the forms and practices of other communities—and the preparation for reunion would be ripe. I am constrained, however, to confess that, in spite of such signs as these, that preparation is not yet complete. The words which I have quoted to you are amongst the most cheering utterances of large-hearted Christian men. They do not represent, as yet (judging at least from certain public manifestations), the feeling or conviction of the majority of Nonconformists. Neither would they awaken, I fear, as generous a response in the hearts of the majority of Churchmen. Were formal Conferences to be held at present between Churchmen and Dissenters with a view of arriving at terms of union, questions, I doubt, would arise in regard to the Church's doctrine and administration which could not, in the existing state of things, be fairly and temperately discussed. In maintaining the Deposit of faith on the one hand, the Church might be thought too rigid and unyielding; while in pressing on the other hand their objections and requirements, Dissenters would assuredly be thought unreasonable and exacting. I have little faith, I own, in the bickerings and bargainings of diplomatic Conferences. Such Conferences too commonly waste their time on minute and unimportant matters, and end by engendering stiffness, suspicion, and irritation. Far more hopeful, I believe, will be the effort to make the Church of England so powerful and sensitive an organ of the Spirit of her Divine Master that every living Christian in the nation should find in her fitting channels and full employment for all the energies of the regenerate heart.

Can we believe that our Church is such an organ at the present? And if not,—the question naturally arises, in connection with our subject,—What changes must she suffer in order to make her such?

We shall only perceive the true direction of these necessary changes, when we have once fully apprehended the Church's true *nature* and *functions.*

But who fails to apprehend these things?—I may be asked. Who needs to be told at this time of day what is the essential nature—what are the distinctive functions—of the Church of Christ? I can only answer that I think these are the things which many advocates of conciliation (both Churchmen and Dissenters) need to study more than anything else. In the volume, for instance, to which I have referred, it is tacitly assumed again and again that the Church is, above all things, an organization for the maintenance and propagation of certain moral truths and principles. Undoubtedly the Church is this—but (the New Testament being our standard) as certainly *not* this *before all things else.* Considered in its essence, the Church is the Body of Christ, the Temple of the Blessed Spirit, the earthly organ of His Resurrection Life. The Church exists, therefore, in order that, before all things else, she may receive and communicate her Divine Redeemer's *life.* This is the secret of her power, the pledge of her immortality. What is the *aim,* the *use* of dogma? To define and express the *source,* the *organ,* the *conditions* of Christ's life. What again is the *object* of *worship,* the aim of preaching, the office of sacraments? Simply to replenish the Church and the world with the life of the Glorified Redeemer; seeing that all these, when viewed in their central purpose and loftiest character, are only so many golden pipes of the sanctuary through which the waters of Christ's life flow down to the earth.

But if such indeed be the central characteristic and office of the Church of Christ on earth, then assuredly that *branch* of this Church corresponds most *exactly* to the desire and design of the Saviour, which *satisfies* most abundantly the deepest wants and aspirations, which *exercises* most adequately the sanctified impulses and energies, of the awakened soul.

Measured, then, by this standard, is the Church of England already as fit an organ for the increase and communication of her Heavenly Bridegroom's life as we can easily conceive that she ought to be? Because, if not, then it behoves us, I believe, to strive after the perfecting of the organ, before we can hope to make evident to our fellow-Christians of other communions, its exclusive claims to their allegiance and affection.

In further prosecuting the considerations thus suggested to us, I would remind you, in the first place, that in a perfect earthly medium and embodiment of the Divine life there are certain necessary powers which may be called *statical,* and certain others which, by comparison, may be called *dynamical.* I call those *statical* which, less than others, depend for their due exercise upon the active habits of the community, just as the power of resistance and endurance in the bones, although essential to the well being of the body, depends for its maintenance less immediately upon the active habits of the body, than do the peculiar powers of the organs of respiration and digestion.

Now in Christ's spiritual body, the Church, there are both statical and dynamical forces. Together, they make up the total effective energy of that body; and may be regarded as exercised each by its distinct organ. As organs of the statical forces of the Spirit-bearing community, we may point to such divinely-appointed institutions as the holy Sacraments—organs which are less directly and considerably affected by the active habits of the body—while as organs of its dynamical powers, we may point to such institutions as those for public *legislation*, *worship*, *teaching*, and *work*.

If now it be asked in respect to the Church of England, in which of her institutions does she need change and improvement, in order that she may become the fittest possible medium and embodiment of Christ's life upon earth, I should answer, first, in respect of the essential character of those institutions, which, like the holy Sacraments, are the organs of her statical powers, she needs no change at all. In that department of a Church's organization, respecting which our Dissenting brethren may well feel the gravest misgivings, the history and organization of our Church leave nothing to be desired.

Far otherwise, however, is it in respect to those other institutions which I have ventured to call the organs of her dynamical forces.

Take first the organs of public legislation. At present the Church has *two* organs of this kind, the Convocations of York and Canterbury. We cannot be too thankful for the maintenance of these institutions down to our own time. Their very existence proves that, when becoming an Establishment, the Church did not surrender her right to self-government. Still, as at present constituted, it must be confessed that they afford no real representation of the Spirit-bearing Body of Christ, in whose name they sit and deliberate. Hence their weakness, and the comparative unfruitfulness of their otherwise admirable debates. So long as their present composition is maintained, nothing, I fear, will be able to procure for them public confidence and attention; neither the high character of their individual members, nor the ability of their debates, nor their diligent attention to business. Their fatal defect is, that in an age when the civil legislature is becoming representative of ever wider areas of public sentiment and interest, they retain unaltered the essentially autocratic characteristics stamped upon them in the days of the Tudors.

But how, then, are these venerable bodies to be made truly representative—the adequate and effectual legislative organ of the Church of England?

My answer to this important matter must be *briefly* given, although it has not been the less carefully considered.

Any reform of Convocation, to be *useful*, must, I believe, in the *first* place, be *extensive*. The emergency in which we find ourselves is *serious*. The time in which to meet it is short. I do not hesitate to repeat the opinion expressed in my presence by one of the foremost statesmen of England, that, unless the Church of our nation finds the means of dealing effectually with the great practical and spiritual difficulties which press for a solution, she will be disestablished and disendowed within the lifetime of the present generation. But make her as perfect an organ of the Divine Spirit as she is capable of becoming, and no one will wish for her spoliation. Those who are at present her enemies will gladly work within her lines, and feeling that she furnishes to them the very facilities and authorization for spiritual labour which they have so long sought in vain, will swell the ranks of those who demand with an ever louder and sterner emphasis that the means of carrying Christ's life to the poor and needy shall not be applied to the endowment of hospitals, nor to the establishment of secular schools. But remember, all depends upon this,—whether the Church of England be made the *adequate organ* of the nation's spiritual life. Without this, no government in the world can maintain to us the inheritance of our fathers.

Now, since the *first step* towards disposing of our *most serious* practical difficulties is the securing a legislative organ capable of dealing with them effectually—of *so* dealing with them, I mean, as to command the assent of both Church and nation, I think I am justified in repeating that any reformation of Convocation, to be *useful*, must be CONSIDERABLE; that under existing circumstances, to be timid is to be impotent; to be thoughtfully *daring* is to be prudent and practical.

But although any useful reformation of Convocation must needs be *considerable*, still, in order to be *practical*, it must also be *simple in plan* and *familiar* in character,—so simple in plan as to involve no complicated and incomprehensible arrangements, and so familiar in character that it shall follow lines of development well known and tried.

Contented with indicating thus briefly the principles which I have kept in view, I shall only state, without further justification, a plan of reform which I venture to suggest, in the way of a rough outline and first approximation.

Let the Lower House of Convocation embody simply the principle of Representation. Let no member sit there in virtue of any ecclesiastical office, but all be representatives in fixed proportions of the Clergy and Laity.

Let the Upper House of Convocation embody simply the official and Hierarchical element in the Church. Let no member sit there in virtue of popular election; but let the House consist entirely of the Bishops, and of such dignitaries of the Church as it might be thought desirable to appoint to places therein in virtue of ecclesiastical office.

This would give us, with very simple alteration, a really representative organ of legislation, so closely resembling the two Houses of Parliament, that its constitution would be easily understood, and the duplex exercise of its authority readily determined.

I cannot help thinking, also, that such a reform in the institution of our legislative body might open the way to dealing with one of our most formidable difficulties; that, perhaps, which has been the greatest occasion of stumbling to Nonconformists, and of *despair* to Church Reformers,—I mean the question of *patronage.*

It is a favourite taunt of Nonconformists, that the manifold abuses of our system of patronage are a *necessary* consequence of the union of Church and State. Of *such* a union as that which now exists they may be; but not of such a union as it would be fair and reasonable to require. Is it always to be assumed that, while the statesmen of the Tudor period were infallible in *nothing* else, they *were* infallible in their determination of the proper conditions of a union between Church and State? Or is it not rather time to ask the question, Which of their ordinances in this matter were actually *essential* to such a union, and which of them the result of mistake, or the provision for temporary circumstances? I believe that a careful consideration of this momentous question will convince any thoughtful man that the only *necessary* condition of such a union is this—that (leaving aside the question of *doctrine*, with which, except on the occasion of a decisive change in national sentiment, the State has no concern), government shall require that all the legislation of Convocation shall be submitted for the approval of the Civil Power. Ecclesiastical legislation *may* interfere—it often *has* interfered—both in the experience of the Church of Rome, and in the estimation of the people called Methodists,—with the civil liberty of the subject. And upon the ground that it is necessary to *protect* that civil liberty, it is, I believe, wholesome both for Church and State, that upon all the practical legislation of the Church, the State should have a veto.

This, however, is, I believe the sole *necessary* condition of the union of those two great organizations.

Let this be distinctly recognised, and then, difficult as the task confessedly is, a method may yet be found of dealing with the question of patronage.

Let it once be seen that the Nomination of Bishops is not an *essential* prerogative of the Crown—and the way would be open for referring this matter to a Synod *so really* representative of the Church's life and sentiment as that which I have proposed.

Again, it is now *felt* by an increasing number of laymen—that to sell the cure of immortal souls is a thing even *more* monstrous than it was in the bad days of slavery to sell their perishable bodies. But to leave the spiritual aspect of the question aside, many a patron feels already that he has no more *equitable* right to *sell* the presentation to a living, than to sell a pew in a parish Church. The right was not given to him to *sell*, but only to *exercise*; that he, and those who shall follow him in possession of his estate, shall nominate the spiritual minister whom that estate maintains.

Nay, more; the number of patrons is daily increasing, who feel that even this limited right should be further limited—that it would be a mistake to continue to them unrestricted power of nomination—that the feelings and opinions of the parishioners should be consulted—that it is *desirable* that, in selecting a man who is to break to them the bread of life, the patron should take account of any recommendation which, in an authorized way, they may make to him. Let the Crown set the example; let patrons feel that in the new Convocation they have themselves a voice in the election of their Chief Pastors; and then I cannot doubt that in *conformity* with so godly and Apostolic an example, and in deference to the growth of an irresistible public opinion, patrons will consent to such a limitation of their powers as that which I have suggested.

I have considered so far the necessary improvement of the Church's organs of legislation. But now, in the second place, she has organs of *instruction*, and these need improvement also.

One of these organs of instruction would be the reformed Convocation to which I have referred; for it would be necessarily one of the functions of that body to give to the Church public and authoritative definition and expression of the truth. In connection with this subject I would venture to repeat the Bishop of Salisbury's emphatic and weighty declaration—that where you have once obtained an adequate representation of the Spirit-bearing body of Christ—*it must be trusted!* For while it is true that definitions of the faith, so compressed and historical as those embodied in the Apostles' or the Nicene Creed, admit of no change or modification whatsoever; yet in that further drawing out of the faith which is necessary in order to point its application to increasing secular knowledge, and widening intellectual needs—change is inevitable and desirable—unless, indeed, any should venture to hold that ONLY the Church of the Reformation was a *living* Church—and that her Master's illuminating Spirit has left his earthly body in these latter times.

But further:—the Church not only teaches by means of her Creeds and Liturgies, but also by the living voice of her individual members. And in this particular also, I believe that the fundamental idea of the Church would prescribe to her a greater breadth and elasticity of operation. Complaint was made the other day that our clergy are taken too exclusively from the members of a particular social grade. And I think with reason: not only because there are masses of men, long alienated from the Christian Church, who are more easily moved and led by men of their own rank in life, forms of speech, and turn of thought, than by scholars who have been nurtured in a very different atmosphere—but much more because, in his arousing and illuminating influence, the Divine Spirit of Christ confines Himself to no one class—and because it necessarily follows, from this fact, that any Church, which by the severity of its requirements excludes the members of a particular class from its ministry, must neglect and even *waste* mighty elements of ministerial power. Wherever the heart is set on fire by the love of the Lord Jesus, *there* will be an irresistible impulse to bear witness to the greatness and excellence of that love. No doubt much of this witness must be borne in private. Not every man who loves Christ is fit to occupy the position of Teacher. The Church will have to exercise discrimination. She will have to repel, as now, mere carnal ambition, and the fondness of an overweening conceit, unconscious of its own deficiencies. But are these valid reasons, why she should so hedge about the path to her ministry with pecuniary requirements, that hardly any poor man can enter thereby? Keble College and similar institutions may do something to remedy this grievous fault, but not enough—and not altogether, I venture to think, in the right direction.

Even when a parish Clergyman has found some poor man, of great natural ability, whose heart the Lord hath touched—it remains, I admit, that before he can be counted *fit* to take part in the ministry of the word, he shall by *some* means, have acquired adequate knowledge of the Scriptures. Now it is just at *this point*, that propositions for the ordination of poor men are ordinarily wrecked. For when one says that by *some* means poor men must needs obtain adequate knowledge of the Word of God—it is triumphantly asked, By *what* means?

I believe that the means have been already *found* by an excellent and learned presbyter of the English Church, who perhaps never thought of *seeking* for them.

Let some of our poor and large parishes be turned into seminaries of the Clergy; officered by men having something of the spirit and culture of Dr. Vaughan, the Master of the Temple. When a man is found by any parish Clergyman, who, in his judgment, has natural capacity and a divine vocation for the ministry, let him be sent in the character of *Reader* to such a school of the prophets. There he would receive divine instruction from the presiding minister, and give in return, to that minister's parish, the hearty labour of an able and devoted servant of Christ. It would soon be seen, in such a twofold education, whether the candidate were fit for the work—and even if he were not, not a day would have been lost in the trial. That candidate would be the better man all his life for having laboured in such circumstances.

Happily the mother churches, in most of our large parishes, are still situated in the centre of the poor. Let only appointments be made to the Incumbency of those great churches, with a view to the establishment beneath their shadow of such schools of the prophets—and all that would be further needed in the way of pecuniary provision, for the carrying out of such a plan, would be the creation of a special fund for the payment of candidates, in connection with their work as Scripture-Readers.

I cannot exaggerate the importance of some such movement as this. It would tend more than anything else to the healing of divisions *within* Christ's kingdom, and to its vast extension without. Let those who are disposed to be careless or idle in this matter discern the signs of the times. Twenty years ago I have heard the priests of the Roman Church in Ireland stigmatized on account of their ignorance and low descent as *hedge*-priests. Well, what has happened? The peasant's sons won the peasants, and these again, but the other day, by the mere force of their opinion and feeling, cast down a great and wealthy and learned Church from her pride of place—even *though* she taught the purer truth of God. Mark again what has just happened in France!—The republican government in Lyons were summarily stopped the other day in a crusade against the priests and seminarists of the Church. Why? Because the Republic needed the strong arms of the peasants of Brittany and La Vendée—and these had been made Catholics by the lowly parish priests. The future is with that Church which secures the masses; and, under God, the masses will be with that Church which seeks to *quicken*, and to *employ* the organs of the Holy Spirit amongst themselves.

The view which I have put forward—that no endowment of the Spirit of Christ should be wasted—compels me, of course, to admit that, even when powers of teaching are given to the Laity, laymen should be called upon to teach. I do admit this. Preaching is not exclusively a function of the priesthood. This was recognised in the practice of the ancient Church. It has been recognised, I record with thankfulness, by many of the Bishops of our own. Already by several English Bishops formal commissions are granted to gifted laymen to preach either in the streets, or in schoolrooms, or in any unconsecrated building. The only *extension* of this liberty which I plead for is this—that, upon certain specified occasions, they shall be permitted also to preach in the Church itself. There is a well known Canon of the Ancient Church, forbidding laymen to preach when a priest was present, which of course shows that he *might* preach when the priest was absent. I plead for the restoration even of this privilege, and not only on account of the lay preacher, but also on account of the *place* where I ask that he shall be allowed to preach. I want to see our Churches regarded with that reverence and affection which they would most surely command, if they were, as they should be, the places where *everything* is done, which bears directly upon the public quickening of the Divine Life.

Why do many enter our Churches now with a sense as if they were passing into a colder air and a gloomier light? Because we have carefully banished from it all the warmer and more earnest manifestations of the Divine Life. Let the church (and not the *schoolroom*) be used, as it was during the late twelve days' mission, as the place where, under the free promptings of the Spirit, earnest Clergymen might seek to draw careless sinners to their Saviour—and then it would be to the *church* and not to the *schoolroom* that men would turn, with yearning affection, as their *Bethel*, and house of *vision* upon earth!

I think that the Fathers of the Church are right in confining our liberty of action on such occasions within definite limits; only I would plead that, on these and other exceptional occasions, men might be allowed to pray as the living Spirit of Jesus moved them. Well is it for us,—who can tell *how* well, till he has missed them?—that in our ordinary public approaches to the throne of grace, we should take into our lips (*all* of us in common) those words, not of *flame* but of *fire*, which have borne up to God the longing, the hope, the adoration of a hundred generations. But these sprang originally from living human souls—and the spirit which inspired them still burns and breathes in the hearts of His people.

Something more I would have said on the Church as an organ of work, and on Parochial Councils as the Church's fittest local instruments. Time, however, is short, and I have already spoken fully on this matter to the Congress.

It remains, therefore, only to express my conviction, that, if we strive earnestly, by such methods as those which I have indicated, to make our beloved Church an adequate organ for the reception, expression, and dissemination of the Divine Life of Christ, the day is not far distant when we shall see Evangelical Dissenters in England making overtures (as the Primitive Methodists have already done in Ireland) for reunion to the Church of their fathers. And till that happy day shall come, let us endeavour by God's help to maintain towards Nonconformists the language and attitude of brotherly affection and respect. They are our fellow-Christians; united to us *now* by a bond stronger and more abiding than that of domestic, social or ecclesiastical fellowship—by that eternal bond of the Spirit—by the common possession of that eternal life of Christ—which makes us now members of one living body, and which shall keep us mutually dependent parts of the same, world without end.

ADDRESS.

The Rev. GEORGE BODY, Rector of Kirkby-Misperton.

MR. MEDD began his address to you by saying that he would have to travel over ground which had been already occupied by the President in his inaugural address. I can only say that I also feel that the words I had purposed to speak have been anticipated; especially in that noble-hearted address which we have heard from Mr. Ryle. Strange as it may seem to find our names thus in contact on this great question,—though it is not for the first time since *The Daily Telegraph* linked them together, at the time of the London Mission—I can only say that the particular steps I desired to recognise and to advocate have been, to a very large extent, anticipated by his recommendations. For my own part, let me add that, unable as I am to rank myself with the school to whose opinions he gives expression—I yield to no man in my admiration of one who is not the least known, or loved, among the Evangelists of the Church of England.

Called on as I am, however, to consider this question of reunion, I may perhaps be able to contribute something to the discussion, even if it be by travelling over ground already occupied.

First of all, let us distinctly understand what the object is we have in view, in seeking the union of Christians in England, within the old fold of the English Church. Yielding to no man in my admiration—I don't know that I ought to use a word so patronising—but yielding to no man in my devotion, to the Church of England, I cannot, rejecting the infallibility of the Church of Rome, pretend to believe in the infallibility of the Church of England. When then I go forth to ask the Nonconformist to meet me within the bounds of the English Church, I do not understand that I am to take with him a hard and fast line, and to claim his allegiance to Anglicanism as the exact expression of the mind of Christ. For my own part, I do not believe that Anglicanism is a perfect representation of the ancient Church, and therefore I, for one, must refuse to rally under the banner of that prelate who this morning advocated, as the way to reunion with foreign Churches, the system of proselytizing to the Anglican Church. I do not believe in any such policy. It is because we have so many "isms" that the divisions of the family of Christ are so saddening as they are to-day. But if I understand aright the question of reunion, as debated to-day, we are seeking to embrace in our discussions, not only the Protestant Nonconformist at home, or the members of the Reformed Societies on the continent, but also the Eastern and Western portions of the Catholic Church. We yearn, if so we may, for a general return to the faith and practice of Christ's undivided Church—to see realized once more in Christendom that which was not always a dream, but for many a hundred years a God-blessed fact—the union of believers in the one great visible society of the Holy Catholic Church.

But in seeking the realization of this great object, we, as members of the English Church, are bound to go forth and strive for the ingathering of our fellow countrymen, who at present are not united with us in faith and worship, into the ancient fold of the Church of England. For I believe that the work our Lord Jesus Christ came to do was this—to raise up in this earth a visible society, and to bring into that society the scattered family of the children of men; there to be united in a common worship, and to have their hearts fired with the passion of a common love. This then is the work which we have to do. We have to gather into the Church of Jesus Christ—the living historical representative of which, in England, is the Church of England—we have to gather into it, I say, as best we can, all in these realms who know and love our dear Lord's name.

When then we come to look upon the present position of English Nonconformity, we find that, practically, it is divided into four great schools. The first is a school of great influence, but of comparatively insignificant numerical strength. With it there can be no reunion, for it is separated from us by such a barrier of faith, that we dare not hold out the hand of peace, since it could only be done at the price of treason to our Lord. Wide as are the bounds of the Church of Christ, there is a limit to her comprehension. She cannot, without treason, admit to her altars the deniers of the Lord's Divinity; and union purchased on such terms were too dearly bought. Such a policy, too, were fatal to our efforts for reunion with the other sections of Nonconformists, for—thank God for it—the heart of English Nonconformity beats true to Christ upon this point.

There is next that section which represents in our midst the old Puritan spirit, which is composed of those two great denominations—the Congregationalists and the Baptists. Then there is the great family of Methodism, using that term in its widest sense. And then there is the powerful section of Christians, which occupies a foremost place in the evangelizing work of the day, and which, amidst many errors, gives a plain witness not only to the love of Jesus for sinners but also to the obligation laid on the people to go on to perfection—I allude to the Plymouth Brethren.

We find ourselves in contact then with these three great sections of orthodox Christians, and our object is to bring them back to the fold of their fathers. It seems to me that the only way in which we can realize this object is by going forth and meeting them, not only in word but in action. This approach to them may be made in two ways. The majority of these societies have representative assemblies. We might approach them with distinct proposals of union. I know that it is all but certain, that under existing circumstances such an approach would be destitute of present tangible results. I cannot however consider that such a movement towards union would be altogether fruitless. It cannot be wrong or unwise for us to hold out the hand, even if the hand of our brother be not stretched out in response. There would be a power in such an action, as giving an effective expression to the yearnings of our hearts.

But there is another path to reunion open to us. I believe that each of these various societies of Christians witnesses for some great truth and practice, which is a part of the Church's heritage, but of which, in the time in which the sect arises, she has been unmindful. Then our path to reunion lies in accepting the witness thus given to us, in boldly recognising the forgotten truth, in satisfying the felt want, and so ministering to those in the Church that food which, if withheld from them, they will seek in the ranks of Nonconformity.

Look, for example, at Methodism. Whence came it into our midst? In "a dark and cloudy day" the Holy Spirit brought home to the hearts of its founders the conviction of their solemn obligation, as men who had heard the voice of Jesus, themselves to go forth as His evangelists. Hence came that grand movement of revival, which was so powerful for good in our land. Oh, how I love the men who toiled in it, from John Wesley to his less known followers—John Nelson, and such as he—who went forth with burning hearts and told men that dearest of all tales—the tale of Jesus' blessed love! Exactly the same spirit is working in our midst to-day, and doing a like blessed work in the saving of the lost. There are many who can individually testify, "I am a Dissenter because it was from some Nonconformist's lips that I first heard in real earnest tones that I had a soul to be saved or a Saviour who died to save it." There is no way towards reunion more plainly marked out than this. Let the Church gird herself to evangelizing work. Oh that she would "stir up the gift that is in her!" then were she unequalled in this ministry, for she is the God-sent evangelist. For this work her first requisite is—the baptism of her ministry with the baptism of fire. Her preachers must first know what as evangelists they proclaim. Oh! if God gave us such a ministry—a ministry of men who have yielded themselves in very deed to God, and by faith in Jesus Christ found peace in Him, then indeed would there be opened up to us a grand prospect of the reunion of many of Christ's scattered sheep in the fold of the Church. But, to mount up to this work, more than this is needed. Many a man, attracted to Dissent, will give you this as his reason—"When I turned to God first of all, I wanted sympathy. I looked around the church at the people in their great pews, and I didn't know a single man to whom I could speak about my soul—not one to whom I could look for guidance in my perplexity. Then I went to class, and there I found sympathy and help." We must be prepared to meet this want. We need the wide extension in our midst of agencies which shall be to us what the class system is to Methodism, freed from those special dangers with which that system is so rife.

But not even yet are the needs of this aspect of our question supplied. The hearts of many yearn to speak out to others the love of the dear Lord; that love is to them the very joy of their lives, and they would have others to be "partakers of their joy."

"Oh that the world could taste and see
The riches of His grace!
The arms of love that compass me
Would all mankind embrace."

This man must speak out the truth he has heard. Recognising the fact that the "work of the evangelist" is not exclusively a priestly work, you must give him a recognised position and a definite work in which he may use for the good of the body the gift which has been given to him by that Spirit who "divides to every man severally as He will." For unless he can speak his message under the guidance of his parish priest, by the very fire that is burning within him he will become a Methodist preacher. As a practical step towards the solution of this great question, let us go back to our parishes, resolved to preach Jesus, to deal personally with the souls of our people, to band them together for mutual sympathy and aid, and prepared to give a sphere to every man, however lowly, to labour for the conversion of sinners, in preaching the Gospel of the grace of God. So will you retain within the Church many who will else be attracted to Dissent, and recal to the ancient fold some of those who have fallen from her. The large majority of Dissenters are not so, at least in the first instance, for Dissent's sake; they wander into these societies in their search for bread to eat and water to drink.

When we come to deal with the Plymouth Brethren, a like policy commends itself to me. Their witness is one which has worked out very powerful results in all the various classes of society. What is the strength of this witness? On two points at least it meets the revealed will of God and the needs of the believing section of our land, as far as the members of this section are found in the ranks of Protestantism. I allude to the prominence given in its practical system to the weekly "breaking of the bread," and in its doctrinal teaching to the necessity of growth in the life of grace. Alas, "the breaking of the bread" is to them wanting in the fulness of the Eucharistic gift; and the onward stages of the spiritual life find in them but a confused and indefinite expression. Yet is their witness none the less precious as giving expression to a conscious want. To this want the Church can minister, if she be true to herself. Revive the weekly Eucharist, and, gathering the hungry around the altar of God, feed them with the Bread of Life. Open up to them the wondrous vision of the spiritual life in the purgative, illuminative, and unitive ways. So acting, will you be meeting those wants, which, for lack of faithfulness to the Church's life and preaching, lead many of our most earnest people to wander from the Church.

With the distinctive witness on one cardinal point of the Puritan section of Nonconformity I am willing to confess a very strong sympathy. These societies witness for the freedom of Christ's kingdom from secular government, and proclaim the sovereignty of the Lord over His Church. I cannot look around me in England to-day and say that that witness is not needed. When I see that sovereignty ignored as it is in the English Church to-day—when I remember that, through the power of the State, men who deny the very fundamental articles of the Christian faith minister at her altars and fill her pulpits, my whole being thrills with horror at this awful sin. If we are ever to be at one with those who are in the Congregational and Baptist Societies, we must boldly unfurl the banner of the sovereignty of Jesus in His Church. I do not think that this of necessity means the raising of the cry for Disestablishment. I for one am not, however, afraid of such a policy, if God so will. But, apart from this cry, I do believe that we are called on to give expression to our feelings of impatience under the bondage we now endure. In plain teaching of the spiritual powers of Christ's kingdom, and then in earnest contest for the salvation of those liberties with which the Lord has endowed His Church and which are recognised in the great charter of our nation's freedom, we shall be meeting a spirit that now moves towards Dissent.

I believe that if, in these three aspects of her work, the Church is faithful to her mission—if she goes forth boldly in evangelizing work—if she lovingly ministers to the wants of believing people—and if she boldly contends for the sovereignty of Jesus in His Church—then she will have done not a little towards the solution of the question of the reunion of English Christians in the English Church. For we must remember that Nonconformity lives by the constant recruiting of its ranks from those who are nominally children of the Church. It is comparatively powerless in maintaining its hold on "the children of the third and fourth generation." This stream of secession will be materially diminished by the Church, in faithfulness to her mission, ministering to the wants of men. So too will she attract to herself an increasing number of the religious minded Nonconformists. And so, finding for this question a solution which our scattered ones will welcome, shall we gather into our Father's fold those who love our Lord in sincerity, there once more to offer unto Him the common worship of a redeemed people.

DISCUSSION.

The Right Rev. the BISHOP OF PETERBOROUGH.

MY LORD BISHOP,—After the fervid speeches to which we have been listening on the side of liberty and relaxation of law, in the spirit of which I most heartily concur, and from which I hope I have derived some benefit, I fear I shall hardly induce you to listen patiently to a few words of colder caution from one of those whose difficult and delicate duty it is, in these days of Church reform, if not to maintain, at least to administer, existing Church laws. As I listened to Mr. Ryle's most winning and seductive speech, I felt myself exactly in the position of that traveller he described, upon whom the sun was operating so very powerfully that he felt he must unbutton his cloak at once: but, on the other hand, I remembered also the story of the captain on board a certain ship, who had a bag confided to his charge, which it was his duty to keep tied, except at certain times and seasons, and owing to whose negligence the bag was opened—the result being that all the winds rushed out at once, and the ship was wrecked. Let me say then a few words on the side of law. I am perhaps as sincere and as ardent a Church Reformer as any one in this room. No one feels more deeply than I do the need of Church Reform; but because I feel it so deeply, I also feel the need of fixed and definite Church laws; and for this reason,—that I believe law to be the only possible safeguard of liberty, the liberty whether of pastor or flock. Abolish law—Church law—even the laws of Church worship, and one of two things necessarily follows: either that the pastor imposes his law upon the congregation, or that the congregation impose their law upon the pastor; and either of these evils would be fatal to the very existence of a National Church. Let me take an instance. Mr. Ryle, in the course of his paper, once or twice suggested that clergymen should have the right to use, alternately and at their own discretion, certain portions of the Church Service, having previously obtained the assent of the parish or congregation. Mr. Ryle omitted to say—"having had previous reference to, or consultation with, their Bishop." I will suppose, however, that the Bishop is altogether ignored. Mark what follows. The clergyman, whoever he may be, appeals, in Mr. Ryle's theory, to his congregation, and he obtains their consent. Now, in the one word "consent" lies the whole fallacy of this theory. Does he obtain the unanimous consent of all his congregation? Because if he gets the consent of the majority only, while the minority strongly dissent, then you have a fruitful germ of schism planted in every such parish. Now I believe the only effectual protection against such endless schism is definite law. I do not mean narrow law. A law may be very broad, and yet very definite. It has been assumed, for instance, in this discussion, that the limits of our Church might be extended with advantage; very possibly they might. But that is very different from breaking down her barriers so completely as to leave her with no other limits than the discretion of her ministers and their congregations. I feel, moreover, a great objection to give to any pastor in our National Church the right to use or to omit, at his discretion, those portions of our service which involve important doctrinal principles on one side or the other. I deprecate it not only in the interests of the congregation, but of the unhappy pastor himself, who would be called upon to contend with a most invidious, and oftentimes perhaps a most exasperating condition of feeling among his people: to hear himself called a bigot by some, because he did not omit, let us say, certain portions of the Athanasian Creed; and to have others calling him a latitudinarian, if he did: while, as to the melancholy strifes that would arise between him and his parishioners if he were to adopt an alternative use of portions of the Burial Service, I dare not venture a conception. And now as to union with Dissenters. I can hardly utter the depth of my own longing for a reunion between the Church and the orthodox Dissenters of this country. I can hardly utter my sense of the tenderness with which we should speak of those schisms and separations which, God knows, have been brought about so largely in past years by the sinful neglect of those to whom the souls of the people were given in charge. But when you talk of uniting with Dissenters, you must endeavour to put yourselves as far as possible in the place of those to whom you offer this unity, and ascertain what is their idea of unity. This is just what the preceding speakers have not done. Because, unless you agree as to the definition of the thing you propose, you have really no tangible basis to start from. Now as to what the idea of Nonconformists about unity was, some hundred years ago, there can be little doubt. It was the unity of the spirit, as manifested in outward unity of communion. And to such bodies there would have been very little difficulty in proposing a reunion; because all that would have been needed to bring it about would then have been the removal, as they would have put it, of those practices of our Church which seemed to them to hinder this outward unity.

But is this the modern Dissenting idea of unity? I venture to say it is not. It seems to me that the modern idea of unity is that it is not only unnecessary, but that it is hardly even desirable that the inner unity of the spirit in individuals should be manifested by any outward union in one visible community, joined together by a common discipleship, and in the breaking of bread. If that is the case, then you have undoubtedly a very great difficulty in the way of unity. Let me give you an illustration. The most spiritual Nonconformists, and those most desirous of unity, may be supposed to be found amongst the friends of the Evangelical Alliance. "We are one body in Christ," is the motto of the Evangelical Alliance. But what is the meaning, or the idea, involved in the word "Alliance"? Why, it is an idea totally irreconcileable with the idea of unity. Where there is an alliance, there cannot be unity; where there is unity, there cannot be an alliance. There may be an alliance between England and France, because they are separate and independent powers. There cannot be an alliance between England and Scotland, because they are parts of one kingdom. Therefore, the very idea of that unity at which our Dissenting brethren are aiming is certainly not what we understand by unity. What then will it avail, if we make all the concessions we are desired to make? If we come to the Dissenter, and say, "We have made all these changes in the hope of gaining you," what would the answer be, upon the modern Dissenting theory of unity? It would be this: "We are exceedingly glad, for your sake, that you have become more scriptural, that your Liturgy is purified from errors; but we see no reason in this fact that we should join your communion. We are both Scriptural and independent equal Churches. Let us be on friendly visiting terms, if you like, but we see no reason why we should live in the same house with you." Unless, therefore, it is distinctly recognised by us that the idea of unity, as existing in the minds of our Dissenting brethren, is essentially different from ours, it would, I believe, be a mistake for us to offer them unity. If we attempt to make concessions, while ignoring this fact, then we shall have been making these concessions, and their attendant alterations in our Church laws and practices, upon a false principle, and I believe they will come to no good result in the end. My own opinion is, that we should endeavour to effect our own Church reforms, not so much upon the principle of turning to the right hand or the left, in order to win over this or that Dissenting community—remembering this, that concessions on the one hand may imply loss on the other; but that we should, whether Dissenters or Churchmen, turn more reverently, more searchingly, and more honestly, back to primitive antiquity—in which I include, as above all, Scriptural antiquity; that we should, every one of us, draw nearer and nearer to what we believe to be the Scriptural model of the Christian Church, so far as we can find it in the Bible; that we should endeavour, where Scripture has left us free choice, to adapt the laws and constitution of our Church to the exigencies of our own time, and the circumstances of our own people; and having done this, exercising all loving charity, forbearance, and truthful honesty of speech—for truthful honesty is a part of real love—towards our brethren of the Dissenting bodies, wait and pray until God, in His good time, may give to us the blessings of reunion and of peace.

The Right Rev. the BISHOP SUFFRAGAN of DOVER.

I DO not know whether—while we have been discussing the reunion of Dissenters and ourselves—many of you are aware that our Nonconformist brethren in this place have been a little beforehand with us, inasmuch as it is to their kindness that you are indebted for many of those comfortable seats upon which you have been listening, I hope with some profit, to the speeches from this platform. More than this: I understand that many of the Nonconformist ministers and their people placed their houses at the disposal of the Committee, with a hearty welcome, for the use of the strangers visiting Southampton. Nor do I think that I shall be much out of tune with most of the preceding speakers, if I confess, somewhat sadly it may be, that I fear our hopes of reunion with these our Dissenting brethren must, for the most part,—for there may be many exceptions in detail, —begin and end with such kindly evidences of Christian charity and mutual good will.

I think it must be so, and for this reason. As on the one hand, in dealing with those two ancient Churches of Old and New Rome, which occupied us this morning, I believe we can have no sympathy with them until their accretions of superstition, of false doctrine, and of false assumptions have been swept away by their own hands from the lamp of Truth bequeathed to them by Christ; so I believe, in another direction, we cannot come to any real union with our Nonconformist brethren. And this, not so much by reason of doctrine—for I do not think it is the Church Catechism which stands between us, or even the Athanasian Creed—as by reason of questions of ecclesiastical authority and Church order.

Whether we, amongst ourselves, be High, Low, or Broad Churchmen, this question must always be coming up before us—what do my Orders mean? And I believe the same feeling must be felt in the hearts of many Dissenters—what is meant by the commission which the preacher and steward of God's mysteries bears? What is its origin

—what its virtue? And this question must, I am afraid, in one shape or another, be always springing up and creating difficulties.

This then is one reason why I cannot anticipate a substantial reunion betwixt us, as distinctive bodies of Christians. I say it also, not in spite of, but because of, my most sure belief in a day when all this great perplexity shall come utterly to an end for evermore. Within those golden gates, where so many of the detriments of this life shall be repaired, and so many of the scars of this present shall be for ever healed, all these outer frameworks of inevitable distinction and separation shall crumble and vanish between all those who, in sincerity of purpose—often through the mists and darkness even of error or of imperfect Church systems, have succeeded in grasping the hem of Christ's holy garment. And I believe most assuredly that we cannot now, to any great extent, in this particular anticipate that perfect life of heaven. "There shall be no more sea." Who reads not this parable here in Southampton? What means that forest of German masts yonder? What means it but that yonder war-bound barques cannot, by reason of the dividing sea, now be resting within the ports of their own fatherland? "No more sea" there! Here, divisions, distractions, sunderings. Not perhaps so much, as one has said, that "every Englishman is an island" in himself, as that we live in a very Venice of islands in our social, in our political, and in our religious life; and until Christ come, I do not believe the waters of those channels will ever be utterly dried up, so that we may go over dryshod into the kingdom. But where, here and there, the shores approach, there surely we may build bridges, during these days of waiting, even as our Nonconformist friends in Southampton have set to work to fashion a bridge of kindly sympathy and welcome for us.

And when at last the end comes for which we pray—when the waters shall roll back from those dividing channels, and when the last of those bridges which we have formed with trembling hands shall have been swept away in the retreating flood,—then may we hope, all of us, who through these many divisions and separations have honestly laboured for our common Master, to serve the same dear Redeemer, heart and soul, no more to be sundered, in the kingdom, one and indivisible, of our Lord and of His Christ.

A. J. B. Beresford Hope, Esq., M.P.

I will endeavour to fill up the space of five minutes with a contribution to the great work we all have at heart—and none more so than myself—the work of Christian unity. Let me implore every one present to make this debate a reality and not an unreality. It will be an unreality if you run away with the idea that because the work has to be done, therefore you may risk anything without duly considering what the character of your proceedings should be. It will be an unreality if you at once rush forward with a desire to make sweeping changes, and attempt advances which, for all that you know or believe, may not be acceptable to your Nonconformist friends, or else may be inconsistent with the stability of your own Churchmanship. You should endeavour to bring our outside brethren into the Church; but above all you should endeavour to do what is right. It may be that many of the things which you seem prepared to sacrifice for the sake of this union would be just as great a loss to Nonconformists as they would be to yourselves. If you stand fast in your position, and steadfastly adhere, in charity and with courage, to the old truths of the universal Church, it may be that hereafter those who are now Dissenters will own that they have cause to bless you for the attitude which you had assumed; whereas, if you make too hasty a sacrifice, the only result may be that you will be drawn down and that they will not be drawn up. You may be surrendering traditions of early and pure Christianity of which they, not less than you, will one day feel the loss. It is a matter of deep importance to the spiritual life of the Church, and lies beyond those questions of discipline which you may imagine that you are called upon to compromise. I have one more remark to make. Among the many strong things we have heard to-day, one has especially startled me, although it brought out a ringing cheer. It was that passage in Mr. Moorhouse's speech which had reference to the abolition of private patronage. If you abolish that patronage, you must have your Clergyman appointed, somehow; and have you thought out who is to name him? What guarantee do you propose, to secure that the Clergyman, when named, will be accepted by his flock, and that he will be able to stand at the altar, or in the pulpit of the church, knowing that he is there as a pastor recognised and accepted by all? You have to answer this question first; you have to construct before you demolish. It is very well to say that our law of patronage is inconsistent, worldly, and unholy. But, to come from words to facts, we know that it has produced a great class of holy, pious, learned, God-fearing and withal ready and practical Clergy—that Clergy of the Church of England, which in many respects stands unique among the priesthoods of the world. I simply cite this point as an instance of the difficulties which beset alterations. You should alter, no doubt; but you should alter calmly and thoughtfully. Do not be carried away by mere platform excitement into doing anything hastily. By a judicious use of existing means you may lay deep and broad the foundations of true reunion; but if you run off hurriedly, in the hope of working out plausible though ill considered theories, you may do irreparable injury to the cause you have at heart, and after all be further away from its attainment than ever.

The Rev. E. H. Plumptre.

My Lord,—It is not, I think, saying too much of the order of this Congress, that in many respects the good wine has been kept till the last. [The President: That is why you speak now.] The manifestation of life, and energy, and unity, where one might have looked for differences and antagonisms this day, has, I doubt not, put hope into many hearts, which has not yielded even to the warning caution, or to the desponding sadness, of two right reverend speakers who have preceded me. In that hope I, for one, confess I share; that it may be realized, we must look not to the history of the past only, but also to the signs of the present. For my own part, I look with sadness—with confusion of face, and shame—at the relation in which this Church of England stands to the Nonconformist bodies of the country. It is easy to cast the reproach of that condition of things upon the coldness of the last century; or, as some might say, upon the passions, and the prejudices, and the unwisdom of the seventeenth; or, as others still might say, upon the "great mistake" of the sixteenth century. Yet, what is all this but repeating the words against which we have such solemn warnings—"The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge." My Lord, I hope the day will come, when, in no sense, and for no reason, we shall have occasion to use that proverb any more in Israel. But, in the meantime, let us remember that "the soul that sinneth, it shall die"—that the human soul, or the sect or party, or the Church, which sins against light, against truth, against freedom, and against love, is destined to destruction. In the brief space during which I have to speak, I will not dwell upon the apparent causes of Dissent. You talk to Dissenters, and they may give their objections against certain special passages or phrases in the Prayer-Book. But the real objection lies far deeper. Our Prayer-Book, as it is, with all its claims to our love and reverence, does not meet the wants of the nation's life. I think the experience of the last three centuries proves this—that while it satisfies the holiest and the loftiest souls, the John Kebles and the George Herberts of the Church of England, and the wants of those, if they have wants, who are content to sit in their pews listening to a dialogue between the parson and the clerk,—yet where religious life has been awakened, it does not meet that want, and those who experience it are consequently driven away as a body to the earnestness, the sympathy, and the free utterances of Dissenting places of worship. How is this difficulty to be met? Some would say, "Reform your Prayer-Book": but I have never been able to join in that movement. And for this reason—that it has from first to last been intended to eliminate from the Prayer-Book of the Church of England doctrines which, to say the least, many hold to be vital, and to thrust out from the communion of the Church of England men who have, on every ground of history, a claim to exist within her limits. Therefore I cannot join in that movement. And I confess that I have no hope in a Royal Commission, and very little confidence either in any conference between delegates of the Church of England and diplomatists of Dissent meeting to effect a compromise. But I do wish to give my voice in favour of a relaxation of the penal clauses of the Act of Uniformity. Keep your Prayer-Book as it is —as the standard of doctrine and of practice, but not as the limit of worship. Trust it to the reverence of your people; believe that they will respect its claims; but when the occasion needs it, go forth in the fear of God and the love of souls, and use your freedom rightly. And in that way I think we shall do more to "reform" the Prayer-Book—by giving life to that which now seems stereotyped—than we shall by any Royal Commission, if it sat for five years and issued as many reports.

The Rev. ARTHUR BRADLEY, M.A., Rector of All Saints', Southampton.

MY LORD, LADIES, AND GENTLEMEN,—Out of all the many Clergy of Southampton, I am the first who has obtruded himself upon your attention. I hope you will not draw from this circumstance the conclusion that it was either because the Clergy of Southampton couldn't speak or because they wouldn't speak. It was not quite that, but rather this: we can speak here any and every day; and you, our brethren from a distance—unfortunately for us—very seldom can, or at least you very seldom do, speak here. We thought it better, therefore, to fill your mouths and to shut our own. We thought it better to minister to you, in many cases out of our deep poverty, so far as we could, in carnal things, knowing that we should be abundantly ministered to by you, as we have been, in spiritual things. We were content to be hewers of wood and drawers of, I hope something better than, water for you, leaving to you entirely the office of teachers and of prophets. And now with this brief preface I must indeed rush *in medias res;* and I would say first, that one of the most practical ways of bringing about the reunion of Nonconformists with the Church of England—and if I speak it very plainly it is because I have got exceeding little time—is for Clergymen to treat Dissenting Ministers with a great deal more courtesy and with a little more cordiality. We know the relative positions are very awkward, especially where there is only one Clergyman and one Dissenting Minister in a parish. We know that the Clergyman is very apt either to cut, as we say, the Dissenting Minister dead, or else to look at him as though he were half ashamed to look at him at all. Now I do not see any reason whatever for that. I can recognise Dissenting Ministers as brother Ministers—I don't say full brothers altogether, but surely half brothers, at least. If my brethren cannot recognise them as fellow Ministers, surely they might recognise them as fellow workers for God and for Christ. Then further, I would say that Clergymen should make a point of treating their Nonconformist parishioners with very special courtesy. I don't mean that they should make it their object to gain popularity among Dissenters; if that is their not very large aim, I am pretty sure they will fail in it. But we may treat them with marked courtesy; we may, surely, without in any way attempting to proselytize, or doing that very low sort of thing known as "touting for custom," seek to draw them in oftentimes to the old Church. Thus we may say—as I have said hundreds of times—"I don't ask you to leave your chapel; I don't feel at liberty to ask you directly to come; but if from any cause best known to yourself you like at any time to come—not to my Church but to your parish Church—proud and pleased shall I always be to see you." And we can do more; there are indeed times and seasons when we can do much more. When the steamship *Normandy* was wrecked—of which you all no doubt have vivid remembrance—one of the chief of the crew who was saved happened to be a Wesleyan. As he resided in my parish, I went to him and said,—"I dare say you would rather return thanks to God in your own chapel for your deliverance; but if you would prefer coming to your parish Church, come, and we shall gladly welcome you." He came on the following Sunday, and brought all the others of the crew who were saved. They returned thanks to Almighty God in the old parish Church; and though I had never seen him there before, I don't think I have ever missed him since.

The Rev. W. Dalrymple Maclagan.

My Lord,—First of all let me say with regard to the observations of Professor Plumptre, that I altogether doubt whether it is the insufficiency of the Prayer-Book which to any extent keeps our Nonconformist brethren alienated from the English Church. I believe that this is a mistaken notion of what the Prayer-Book is, and what it is really designed to do. It is intended to furnish a method of worship for the faithful among Christian people. But it is not intended for the conversion of souls, nor is it intended for the nurturing of the higher spiritual life of individual souls; and those who are attempting to find these two things in the Prayer-Book are looking for something that it was never intended to contain. [Expressions of dissent.] I mean that for the development of the higher spiritual life much is needed which is not to be found in the Book of Common Prayer. In treating this question as a practical question, we must bear in mind that, while we are forming schemes for embracing our Nonconformist brethren, they are by no means anxious to be embraced. It is not that we are locking the door against them; but they are not even knocking at the door, and this makes a very important difference in the consideration of any means by which they may be restored to the Church. But while not seeking directly for reunion with the Church, or manifesting any willingness to submit themselves to Apostolic order, I believe there is among them a very deep feeling after Catholic truth, and a very great tendency to return to Apostolic practice. For instance, the volume of essays which has been already referred to shows a deepening sense of the reality of sacramental grace, and a wonderful reviving of the idea of worship, which had been well-nigh lost sight of by Nonconformists in past times. Therefore, though the time may not yet be ripe for practical measures of comprehension, I believe the future is full of hope. What should be the nature of those practical measures we need not now consider: but for myself I feel sure that reunion will never be accomplished by concessions. Setting aside concessions which relate to vital truth, I hold that not even concessions of order ought to be made with the view of drawing our Nonconformist brethren within the Church's pale. Make concessions, if you will, in anything that is human; but touch not anything that is Divine; and Apostolic order, as well as evangelical truth, is Divine; and we dare not part with the one any more than with the other.. Nor do I believe that reunion will be effected by meeting together on platforms, or by saying "there is no difference between us," but rather by a frank recognition of the differences which exist, and an earnest desire to sweep away all the asperities and misunderstandings connected with them. I yield to no man in cordiality of feeling towards our Nonconformist brethren as individuals; and I believe that, by exhibiting personal courtesy and sympathy of feeling towards Nonconformists, we shall do far more to conciliate and attract them than either by any concessions, or by any profession of agreement where it does not in reality exist.

The Ven. Archdeacon Utterton.

My Lord Bishop,—I can conceive of no unity in any religious body except between those members among whom the same love exists towards one and the same Head. In proportion as we realize this bond of union among ourselves, so shall we draw others to us. It is not, I believe, by in any way surrendering our distinctive principles and endeavouring to reduce them to some colourless residuum, but by each of us faithfully maintaining those principles, declaring them in love, and acting them out in the life, that we shall most certainly draw others to us. I think we are liable to one great and special danger, which is this—that if we for one moment are disposed to compromise our principles, or to tamper in any way with the essential truths and the blessed ordinances of our Church, then while seeking to draw some from one particular side, we shall not only further alienate others from us on the opposite side, but be creating greater schism—if there be any at all—among ourselves. I believe the true *eirenicon* whereby to bring others to our fold is that of simply explaining what are really the doctrines and ordinances of our Church; and that we are not to look to any one side from which we may bring over Dissenters *as a body*, any more than we should expect to bring over those belonging to the foreign Churches—whether it be the Church of Rome or the Eastern Church; but if we rise up rightly to discern, and adequately to fulfil, the great mission which God has entrusted to us, we shall more and more absorb *individuals* into our communion and thus our Church will grow by God's blessing to a spiritual appreciation of the great sphere which He has designed her to occupy. No one can be more thankful for the spirit which has pervaded the sittings of this Congress than I am. We owe the gratifying character of our gathering, under God, to the spirit which has guided your lordship in the conduct of the proceedings, to the spirit which has animated its members, and to the spirit of forbearance and Christian charity which has been breathed out in the addresses delivered: and if this does not tend in the sight of the world to draw others to us, I know not what will. Our Church, I believe, is shaking herself from the dust, and arousing all her members; and if these, recognising individually their dependance one upon another, and remembering that they are animated by one spirit, go forth, in trustful confidence upon God, to do that work, which is not the work of one part of the Church merely, but of the Church as a whole, then I believe we shall be more and more blessed of God in ourselves, and be made an increasing blessing to all other bodies of Christians round about us.

The Rev. George H. Sumner.

My Lord,—Five minutes admit of no preface. I shall therefore proceed at once to mention the first practical suggestion, which has occurred to me in connection with the subject, and it is this: I take it for granted that we all, as Clergymen of the Church of England, should treat all parties in our parishes with courtesy; but I think it might be more than that—that we might treat all our Nonconformist brethren in our parishes, where it is possible, practically, as members of our flocks. An eminent divine has called orthodox Dissenters, "Nonconforming members of our Church." What does he mean?

Why, that we—the Clergy of the Church of England—are not ministers of any one denomination, but ministers of the National Church; and, as far as we can, we are to embrace in our ministry all those who are committed to our charge, except any who may repudiate our position. In this way, I believe, a kindly feeling would be engendered which might be a practical step towards reunion. I approach the next step tremblingly; but I believe it is necessary for us to speak out our opinions openly on the question. It has reference to the Athanasian Creed. I am not saying what should be done, nor is it a question whether the doctrine contained in the Creed should be maintained; but whether that doctrine should be embodied in a certain formula of words, and whether that certain formula of words must be held by every person—or (as it certainly does appear to the uninstructed and the unenlightened) that person be consigned to everlasting punishment. Now I say that that is a question which does cry for inquiry; and if any voice of mine could reach the rulers of the Church from this platform, I would ask them, as in the sight of God, to take this matter into their consideration. I don't know whether any of you have read a pamphlet upon the subject, written by "A Dissenter against his will." That pamphlet seems to me to express the earnest longings of a loving heart to be embraced within the Church of England. And what is it that keeps him back? Not the articles—not the Apostles' or Nicene Creed—not the doctrine; but the way in which the doctrine of the Athanasian Creed is expressed. And if this is not a proper subject of inquiry, I don't know what is. Then I would entreat my brethren of the Clergy to avoid extremes in their manner of conducting the services of the Church. If men hold high doctrines, they must hold them as responsible to God; but I am now speaking of the manner of conducting our services; and in questions of this kind, coming, as they do, between us and our spiritual rulers, I think we ought to defer to the advice and the earnest requests of the Bishops of our Church ["question"]. I think that is the question. I believe there are members repelled from coming to our Church, by what I should be false to the name which I have the honour to bear, if I did not designate as the cause that repels them from the fold. There is one thing, however, which we can all do. We can pray for union. Let us, my lord, be earnest in that. Let us pray that the time may come when, with one mind and one mouth, we may confess the Lord Jesus Christ, and praise Him for ever in that temple where there shall be perfect and perpetual union.

The Right Rev. the President.

In order that we may finish our discussion with a lay voice ringing in our clerical ears, I will name Mr. Shipton as the last speaker.

Mr. W. E. Shipton.

My Lord Bishop,—There is one point left upon which I venture, as a matter of experience, to offer a word of respectful counsel. I have listened with great interest to all that has been suggested in the admirable papers which have been read; there are very few of us who will not have learned a great deal from them, upon points on which we may disagree from their authors, and from one another; and I believe they may all be taken as evidence of the deep, earnest longing for Christian union, which now pervades the various sections of the Church and family of God. But, I believe, this desire for union is, to a large extent, the pledge and evidence of the existence of that which we seek, and I dread lest we grasp a shadow and lose a substance. Especially would I warn this Congress against any attempt to conciliate Nonconformists by offering additional facilities for Dissenting Ministers to come over to the Church of England. If you knew, as I do, the way in which the men who come over to you are regarded by their ministerial brethren who remain, and the indignation with which the Nonconformist body, at large, regards the overtures which have been publicly made, and the assistance offered to those educated in Nonconformist Colleges, at the expense of Nonconformist Churches, to relinquish their charges, and to conform to the National Church, you would feel that there was no one point upon which it is necessary for our Bishops to act with greater circumspection and Christian delicacy, than in the admission of such men to the orders of the English Church. I happen to know a considerable number of these clerical "verts." I am quite sure I am correct in saying that those whom they have left do not regret their loss; while I am equally certain that those who have received them do not find that they have gotten much gain. I speak without any reference to personal character, but in relation to their ministerial antecedents, and the necessities of their new position. If I could imagine that any word of mine would lend support to the counsels of the Bishop of Peterborough, I would say that this matter is pre-eminently one in which it is "better to let well alone." For consider what you do. You put a premium on the desertion, to your ranks, of men who are bound, by very substantial considerations, to those whom they now serve.

Much is talked, and perhaps justly, of the way in which Dissenting Ministers are treated by wealthy Deacons. I do not believe that any man of real character, power, or intelligence suffers in this matter more than the trifling annoyances incident to every calling in life. But on the other hand, these men owe to their denominations very much more than, as a rule, the Clergy owe to the Church, or to any institutions connected with it. Education, position, and what we may well believe they value far more, the opportunity of service for their Divine Lord and Master, have come to them for the most part through the liberality and personal kindness of the Churches of which they have been members; and for a Nonconformist Minister to conform to the English Church, whatever we may think about the wisdom of it on grounds of unity or usefulness, is on his part to turn his back on friends and benefactors who cannot enter into his views, and who, from this very inability, are disposed bitterly to resent his desertion. For every one such ministerial proselyte you deepen the feelings of distrust and dislike of 500 lay Nonconformists. If such men come to you voluntarily, and by conviction, after previous separation from the Churches to which they have been allied, no one could or would complain; but to seek them while in charge of Dissenting Churches, to facilitate their re-ordination because of their previous position, or in any way to court them, will be to widen and deepen the gap which lies between the Church and the great body of Evangelical Dissenters.

My Lord Bishop, I dare go further, and to say that, if the Clergy and Laity now present are, as the result of this blessed Congress, stirred up to do the work which lies before them by a more earnest witness to the Divine power and saving grace of the Church's Head, and this in a godly and spiritual emulation with those whom I have been delighted to hear recognised on all hands as Christian brethren, we shall find the spirit of unity in the midst of our diversities, and may be content to relinquish vain attempts after an unattainable uniformity.

The Right Rev. the President.

We have now come to the termination of the very interesting, united, and I hope useful discussions of this Congress. May God's blessing be given abundantly to them; and may the result be greater wisdom in counsel, greater unity of purpose, and greater vigour in action. It only remains that we should go through the formal business which always finishes these meetings of Congress, bearing in mind that there is the pleasant *Soirée* which will afford a little relaxation, and help to wash in the drawing which has been so admirably prepared.

VOTES OF THANKS, ETC.

The Right Hon. W. F. Cowper-Temple, M.P.

Said they had now reached the close of those controversial topics upon which there had been—as he thought there always would be—great difference of opinion. He was permitted, however, to broach a topic and to propose a resolution, upon which he confidently expected the most complete and cordial unanimity. The unqualified success of that Congress, which would make it joyfully and gratefully remembered by most of them for many years to come, was due to nothing more than to the manner in which its proceedings had been conducted by their right reverend President. Among the remarkable features of the Congress were not so much the great learning with which the various topics had been handled, nor the great ability and eloquence displayed in discussing them, as the kindly feeling which had pervaded all who had taken any part in it, and this perhaps was its most characteristic and gratifying feature.

Although upon that platform views of the most antagonistic character had been held forth with fearlessness and with frankness, it struck him that amid all their great and manifold differences there had been a most pleasing recognition of that great bond of union which bound them all together as members of one Church, and also a complete agreement upon the cultivation of all those Christian graces of character which are essential to the maintenance and the development of true spiritual life. Another feature which he was also pleased to notice in connection with that Congress was, that it had afforded a remarkable manifestation of the vigorous life existing in the Church of England. There was a time when spiritual torpor prevailed, and when the Church partook of that torpor. But life was now stirring in all branches of intellectual inquiry; and no observant man could at all doubt that there was a most remarkable wave of spiritual life now rolling through the whole Christian Church. And upon such discussions as those in which they had taken part he rested his hope that the Church of England would be able to remove from its body those bandages and swaddling clothes which were imposed upon it under the different circumstances of 200 years ago; that renewed elasticity would be infused into the rules and regulations, the rubrics and the statutes, which govern that Church; that means would be given her to absorb the spiritual life which was coming into her, and that so she might increasingly become a growing and a living Church, and not an obsolete or a dead one.

The qualities required in any one who presided over the deliberations of such a Congress were, he considered, an intellectual power of grasping every side of a question, and a sympathy and readiness to assist every one who belongs to the Church, who is honest in his searchings after truth and anxious to do his duty. Among the great and eminent qualities which distinguish the Lord Bishop of the Diocese of Winchester, every one would perceive that those which had been mentioned were peculiarly characteristic of him, and that Congress was indeed fortunate in being presided over as it had been during its deliberations. He therefore felt that they would be most willing and eager to join with him in passing a vote of thanks to the Lord Bishop of Winchester for his able, impartial, and fatherly conduct in the chair. And he desired especially to make himself the mouthpiece of the members of that Congress in thanking his lordship for that very able and comprehensive introductory address, which struck the key-note that had vibrated so happily and successfully throughout the greater part of their deliberations.

Mr. W. C. D. Esdaile

Said he had been called upon to fulfil the very pleasing duty of seconding a proposition which afforded a most gratifying and complete climax to the growing and progressive unanimity of that great Congress. In asking their approval to a vote of thanks to the right rev. prelate who had filled the chair with so much labour and pains, and with such eminent advantage to every one present, he believed they would agree with him in the expression of his belief that there was no one single person who had been present at the proceedings which had taken place in that hall, who would not return from that great meeting with a thankful heart that he had been permitted to take a part in it. He was sure also that they would all go home infinitely the better for what they had gone through. The most practical mode of giving expression to their thanks, not only to his lordship but to other right rev. prelates who had been with them, was to endeavour in their various spheres of duty to carry out those sentiments of Christian charity and concord which had been so forcibly inculcated; and as the mouthpiece of the assembly he begged to express their hearty and deep gratitude to the Lord President, both for the labour he had performed in filling the chair, and also for the tone which he had given to the Congress.

The proposition was then put to the meeting, and carried by acclamation.

The Right Rev. the President

Said he thanked them most heartily for their very great kindness. He knew it was really the kindness of their own hearts, as it was that of his two friends who in their kind words had given so very pleasing a colour to his endeavours to do his duty as President of that great assembly. As he said at the beginning, no one person could by any possibility preserve its unity. It was for the meeting to preserve its own unity, and he was most thankful that it had done so. He did believe that great good, under God's blessing, would come from their thus assembling together, being able to listen to the calm statement of one another's views, and to observe the way in which speaker after speaker, who had launched forth some little barque of experiment and hope, had patiently seen it utterly demolished by some succeeding hand; how with placid resignation he had submitted to see each structure, which perhaps he had been thinking of all the year, and which to his own mind seemed complete, seized by the hand of the Bishop of Peterborough or some other hand, and ruthlessly sunk beneath the billows, there to disappear for ever; and yet that speaker perhaps would rise again upon the very next question, and with perfect equanimity launch another little barque only to meet with a like unfortunate fate. This, he thought, had been quite delightful; and to have had it carried out with such perfect good humour and with the exhibition of such brotherly charity in their differences showed that they must have gained a very great deal in their seeking after truth.

Again he most heartily thanked them—one and all—for their exceeding kindness towards their President. The Bishop then read a letter from Lord Henry Scott, which he thought the meeting should hear because it was so sincere in its expression of regret at his inability to attend the Congress through illness. Having read the letter he said he was sure they would regret equally with his lordship his not being there—not only because they would like to have had him there, but still more from the cause of his absence.

Mr. W. S. Portal

Proposed a vote of thanks to the Bishops of Salisbury and Oxford for their powerful sermons previous to the opening of the Congress, and to all those who had read papers or spoken during its sittings.

The Rev. Arthur Bradley

Seconded the proposition, which was unanimously agreed to.

Earl Nelson.

Acknowledged the compliment, and then proposed a vote of thanks to the Bishop of Peterborough for his coming sermon on the morrow at Winchester. When, having been requested to do his best to secure the presence of the right rev. prelate at the Congress, he (Earl Nelson) obtained his consent to read a paper, he then asked him if he would preach a sermon as well; but his lordship replied, "With all my work, you must really give me one or the other." He (Earl Nelson) decided on the sermon; and then he was brazen enough to ask his lordship to speak at the Working Men's Meeting, as he was not going to give them a special paper upon any of the subjects. To that request a willing assent was given. He could therefore bear witness to the great kindness which had brought the Bishop among them, and they could bear witness to the great help he had been to the Congress which he had honoured with his presence.

The Rev. Mark Cooper, Rector of St. Mary's, Southampton,

Seconded the vote of thanks; and, referring to the gratifying character of the Congress, said he had been told by a right rev. prelate, who visited him on the previous day, that at no former Congress—and he had attended several—had he witnessed so much Christian temper, and so much cordiality of feeling, as upon this occasion. To him (Mr. Cooper), as a Southampton clergyman, this was peculiarly gratifying; and for it they were greatly indebted to the skilful guidance of their right reverend diocesan. Whether the unity and the union, of which so much has been said that day, would ever be realized, time alone could determine; but let them re-echo the advice given by Bishop Burnet, of Salisbury, many years ago, when treating of the mode of attracting Dissenters, and which he laid down in the triple injunction,—"Out-live them, out-preach them, and out-pray them." If these three great rules were carried into effect, it would be well, not only for their own happiness, but also for the Church of God.

The Right Rev. the PRESIDENT:

YOU are now asked whether you will give expression to that which has been said to be the highest kind of gratitude, and which is implied in the expectation of future favours from the Bishop of Peterborough.

To this there was a most cordial and enthusiastic response.

The Bishop of PETERBOROUGH

SAID, in the launching of these little boats—a whole fleet of which they were now sending to sea—after the sitting of the Congress, there was considerable difficulty about the lading, as that invariably was — sugar! Now sugar was an exceedingly sweet and luscious fruit: but it was heavy, and required some skill in the loading and unloading. It was his difficult task, however, to do both these at once—to unload one freight, and to load another. He had to stretch out his hand gratefully, to receive his own little portion of sugar, so gratefully and delicately administered to him by Earl Nelson, and the very hearty—indeed, he must say too grateful—proposal of thanks, for what they were yet in expectation of receiving. And having conveyed to them his very hearty and sincere thanks for that which they had given him credit for, and assured them of the very great pleasure it had been to him to come to that Congress, and to see what he had seen, he would proceed to load the next little boat, with the intent of obtaining their thanks—which he was quite sure would be most warmly accorded—to the Executive and other Committees, without whose long and patient and arduous labours that Congress could not have taken place at all. If they were grateful—as they seemed to be—for favours to come, he was quite sure that they would be doubly grateful for the favours they had received. He knew a little of executive committeemen. They were not always as they appeared upon such occasions. To do their work effectually, an amount of experience, judgment, and tact, was required, of which those who only judged by results could have very little idea. It was impossible for them to be too thankful for the patience, judgment, and energy, which must have been put in force by the Executive Committee for months before the assembling of the Congress, and which had ended in the exceedingly happy and useful results of which they had had experience. Therefore, he was sure they would heartily join with him in returning thanks to the Executive and other Committees, coupling with them the names of Mr. Wyndham Portal, Earl Nelson, and the Mayor of Southampton (Mr. Alderman Perkins).

The Bishop of OHIO

SECONDED the proposition, desiring to add his thanks for the wise and impartial arrangements which had been made and carried out by the Executive Committee, and his personal acknowledgment of the gratification and profit he had derived from attending the sittings of the Congress. It was the first Congress he had ever attended in England, although far from being a stranger to many of our ecclesiastical proceedings. If he were to mention any one of the subjects discussed which commanded his special sympathy, it would be that of promoting unity between the Church and Nonconformists. As a bishop of the American Church, he desired to tell them that they always loved to remember and to speak of the Church of England as their beloved and revered Mother Church; and though there was no allegiance between them except that of love, they in

America would never cease to hold her in the bonds of a humble, reverent, and filial regard. They shared in her blessings and her trials; both Churches are equally affected by the same influences; and, on behalf of himself and his brethren at home, he would say, "For this cause we bow our knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named, that He would grant you, according to the riches of His glory, to be strengthened with might by His Spirit in the inner man; that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith; that ye, being rooted and grounded in love, may be able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height, and to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge, that ye might be filled with all the fulness of God."

The PRESIDENT

SAID, the resolution proposed to them was to return thanks to the Executive and other Committees, and as included in this motion they must not forget the two most admirable Secretaries, Mr. Burton and Mr. Hankinson; for all must acknowledge the great trouble they had taken, and the excellent business-like way in which they had discharged the onerous duties they had undertaken.

The proposition having been carried unanimously, the President said there was one more duty, and that was to return their thanks to the Mayor and citizens of Southampton; and eminently amongst those who had shown hospitality to the members of the Congress, and given them a hearty welcome here, were their Nonconforming brethren, who had overlooked the narrow bounds of division. In proposing this resolution, it gave him the opportunity of expressing the unbounded satisfaction with which he acknowledged these acts of brotherly charity. Perhaps they might not know that the very seats on which they were sitting were Nonconformist seats. Many of them had come there in a spirit of charity, to enable them to sit at ease. If there was a discordant voice in the meeting, he was sure it did not come from a Nonconformist bench. He was sure nothing could have been more pleasant and happy than that those their brethren who were so often, to their regret, parted from them, should have set them this most beautiful pattern of true Christian kindness. He moved that they give their thanks to the Mayor and citizens of Southampton for their hospitality, especially mentioning their Nonconformist friends who had united in this act.

MR. BERESFORD HOPE, M.P.,

SAID, he had much pleasure, as coming from a distant diocese, in seconding the vote of thanks. All the other resolutions had been moved by persons distinguished in the Church, or distinguished by their good works among men. Coming from a distance, and having been present at nine preceding Church Congresses, he could honestly say that everything at this Congress had been most admirable, whether viewed in respect to the temper, tone, and character of the discussions, or the hospitality and Christian charity which had been evinced. That proof of practical union which their Nonconformist friends had shown was new to him, but it was not so new as it was gratifying. Before he sat down, he might point out one good collateral work which the Church Congresses did. The direct work was the work they did on the souls, and the minds, and the intellects of those who took part in them. The collateral good was, that it enabled those outside to see and realize, that the Church Congress was not merely an institution of the country, but part of her civil organization; and as an element of loyalty in England, the Church was very powerful, and the Church was powerful for good and not for bad. He looked on Church Congresses as being of most important social value, and as doing a most important social work in this country, at an age when such a work as that could not well be despised. About thirteen years ago, what Mayor of Southampton, or any other place, would have expected to be called upon, as part of his civic duties, to arrange for a great meeting of Clerics and Laity for days together, to discuss Church objects in his town? Now it had become an every-year affair; and he was sure the Chief Magistrate of almost any town in which a Church Congress had not been held during his Mayoralty, would feel that there was one glory the less in his reign. The Mayor of Southampton, to judge from what they saw, had most admirably performed his duty, and with great courage; and he was holding up a bright example for the Mayor of Nottingham to follow at the meeting there next year.

The resolution having been put to the meeting and unanimously adopted,

---

The PRESIDENT said:—

HIS worthy brother of Peterborough had reminded him that he had made an omission in mentioning the kindness of their Nonconformist brethren, which he had desired him to express, that though they were not willing to adopt their *ceremonies*, they had lent them their *forms.* He might now mention that the Executive Committee has chosen Nottingham as the place of meeting for next year's Congress.

Mr. W. S. PORTAL,

IN replying to the votes of thanks passed to the Committees and Secretaries, said he might state that when they began their labours, many of them were unknown the one to the other. Though they had some little difficulties at first to contend with, it was pleasurable to find that everything had ended well, and that the meeting had been of such a successful character. He had no doubt there were plenty of good men and true in the good town of Nottingham: but he could not help suggesting that they should subsidize, at all events, Mr. Burton and Mr. Hankinson, the indefatigable Secretaries, so admirably had they discharged their duties; and that some one should be got to do their duty in Southampton, while they were preparing for the next Congress. He (Mr. Portal) thanked them, on behalf of all the Committees, for the kind way in which they had received the resolution which had been proposed. They had done their work for the good of the Church, and they were ready to do a great deal more for it. They had but one common desire—to make the Church more known, more sympathised with, and more believed in; and they were willing, he was sure, that they should command all their services, as far as they could give them, for the good of their mother Church in the future.

The PRESIDENT then pronounced the blessing, and the sittings of the Congress were brought to a termination.

WORKING MEN'S MEETING.

The working men's meeting was held in the Congress Hall, at eight o'clock, on Thursday evening, and was very largely attended. Every available inch of space was occupied, and the audience—sitting and standing—could not have numbered less than 3,000 persons. Precisely at the hour appointed for the commencement of the proceedings, the President, accompanied by those who were to take a special part in the conduct of the meeting, entered the hall, and received a most cordial and hearty welcome from the assembled multitude. When he had taken his seat in the presidential chair, there were immediately surrounding him the Worshipful the Mayor of Southampton, the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Peterborough, the Bishop Suffragan of Dover, the Bishop of Madras, Bishop Jenner, the Rev. Canon Kingsley, the Rev. Canon Venables, the Rev. Prebendary Thorold, Sir John Kennaway, Mr. Wyndham S. Portal, Archdeacons Utterton and Jacob, the Rev. J. Moorhouse, the Rev. W. Clarke (Taunton), the Rev. J. H. Titcomb, the Rev. E. Garbett, the Rev. Canon Fremantle, Mr. Thos. Chambers, Q.C., M.P. (Common Sergeant of the City of London), the Right Hon. W. F. Cowper-Temple, M.P., and many more of the Clergy and Laity who had taken part in the proceedings of the Congress.

The meeting was opened by the reading of the appointed prayers by the Rev. A. B. Burton, one of the Secretaries.

The Right Rev. the President said :—

My Friends,—Before I call upon any one of those who are about to address you, I want to say a very few words about the meaning of this meeting. It originated entirely with men who are engaged—as I suppose the majority of you are—in working throughout the day, and who were consequently unable to take part in the daily discussions of the Church Congress. It was no part of the original plan of the designers of the Church Congress. It arose in York. I myself am a Yorkshireman, and I have an uncommonly great respect for Yorkshire workmen. I think there are very few people who know better whereabouts they are, and where other people are, which are two most important things to know. Well, the Yorkshire workmen met, and said, "If the Church Congress is not a sham but a reality, it must have something to do with us. We cannot attend your meetings in the day-time, but we will give an evening to you; and if you are really in earnest, don't only talk among yourselves, but come and give us the benefit of what you are talking about, so that we may know it is something more than talk." The managers of the Church Congress at once agreed that they would answer that appeal; and thus, from the time of the York Congress—three out of eleven—one night has been set specially apart for the working men who choose to come and take any part in what has been going on during the day. I have no doubt, my friends, that there really is an interest for all of you in what goes on here. To my mind, it all turns upon this—if what we are doing is real, you must have an interest in it. I believe it is real, and therefore I believe you have an interest in it. Now I will try and show you this in a single word, because my business is simply to open the meeting, and to pave the way for those who are going to speak after me. Here, then, it is:—Christianity and the Church of Christ are the great friends, in every part of the world, to men who are truly working, whether it is with the hand, or with the brain. The only thing almost which Christianity and the Church of Christ have no sympathy with, is puffed-up windbag idleness. They have nothing whatever to do with that. The old scribes and Pharisees were a perfect exhibition, it seems to me, of that puffed-up windbag idleness. They did nothing but find fault with other people, which it is the easiest thing in the world to do. It is far harder to do a good day's work, and a thousand times better.

The central idea of Christianity is this—the glorification of humanity, irrespective of its accidents, in the person of our blessed Lord, the God-man. The central idea of the world, on the other hand, in every land and in every age, is this—the glorification of the accidents of the man, to the putting down of the estimate of the mere man. Now those accidents have no more to do with the real man than the falling leaf, which may drop from it any moment, has with the essential being of the tree from which it drops. The idea of Christianity, I say, is, that our Lord took humanity to Himself, being God, and united it to the Godhead, in His own person, in order not only that He might redeem us, but that He might exalt humanity into the true place intended for it—a glorious place—before the throne of God.

Well, now, you see, if this be the idea of Christianity, it must necessarily follow that there is in it that which answers to the wants of every separate individual sharer in humanity. I am not now speaking only of the religious wants of man, but of his wants as man; when, for instance, trouble comes upon him; when he feels that there is something in him which bids him go up higher—something, not for his own exaltation, for that is only wind-bagism, but something which tells him—"I can do good for my fellows around me,—I can help to exalt and elevate them to nobler enjoyments, and to a higher life." And if Christianity answers to what it professes, it will give to every man who has the desire the power of mounting up himself, and of doing something for the elevation of others. I claim it for Christianity, that this is the very thing which it does. It exalts you and makes you conscious of the greatness of your spiritual birthright. It tells every one of you that you have that within you which is separate from your accidents—separate from your ability, your cleverness, your capacity to hinder or to help, by the exercise of your own natural powers, those round about you. It tells you that you have got the true kernel of manhood in you: and that is a better possession than any external accident in the world round you—better a great deal than gold or diamonds—better than all the prizes which this world has got to show or to give, because it is enduring; because it is capable of enabling you, if you are true in your own positions, to stand one day before the Everlasting Father, and to inherit your own son's-portion, through the Eternal Son, who has bought it for you.

It follows, from this being the central idea of Christianity, that there is no religion, and no institution upon earth, which is so essentially democratic—in the truly high sense of that word, not in the miserable sense of leading a set of men to try to raise themselves on the shoulders of their brethren, by prating about their grievances; but so truly and really democratic, because there is none which so elevates and lifts up every redeemed son of Adam into a true brotherhood with all the sons of God upon earth. There is no other teaching which can make you know, as this can, if you listen to it, the true elevation of every one of you. Everything else, however specious its promises, fails when it comes to the day of trial.

I know that all of you working men at the present day are politicians, and I am not in the least sorry for it. I want you to be politicians and philosophers, and everything else which the intellect God has given you enables you to be. I have no idea of anybody being the better by being kept down in any lawful thing. On the contrary, I want to see you rise—not one over the other by selfishness, and cunning, and scheming; but I want humanity, in the great mass of my fellow countrymen, to be raised by perceiving at once what their capacities are, and what the mode is in which those capacities may be raised; and though I may be wrong, I have the firmest conviction that that Christian faith, of which I myself am a minister, is the one only secret that can raise humanity up to its true level. I say this first to you of the Church as a body spiritual. What is its profession and its aim? Not that it exalts the high people of the earth—there are harder words used about them in the Bible than about any other class of people; not that it exalts the priesthood, for if there are any people about whom harder words are spoken in the New Testament than about any other, it is the old Jewish priesthood—not because they were a priesthood, but because they forgot that they were a priesthood. What is the meaning of a priesthood but a separation of men to give up everything to their brethren; and if, my friends, the Bible tells you that you are, every one, a royal generation—that you are a peculiar people, how are you to prove your title to these designations? Not by each going about seeking his own self-interest, and by trying to push yourselves forward, but by being really members of the great Christian brotherhood of men, and claiming for yourselves in act, in deed, in family life, in city life, in everything that you do day by day, to be a man in whom the Spirit of God is dwelling—who has principles and therefore practices, hopes and therefore works, greater than anything which this world can limit. And that is why I say to you, first of all, that nothing is so entirely democratic, in the true and not in the base sense of that word, as is the Christian faith, because it lifts man up as man, because he is a redeemed man, and not because he possesses the accidental advantages of the passing hour.

And then, my friends, let me further say to you, that apart from this, its spiritual character, in belonging to this Church of ours, I feel that I belong to the most democratic body in the land. I am myself an instance of the democratic character of which I speak. I come amongst you as the Bishop of Winchester, holding a high place in this world. And how did I reach it? I was the younger son only of a private gentleman in Yorkshire. But the Church, as an Establishment, has preserved those lanes leading from the commonest life of England up to the highest estates even in this world, because, with all its infirmities, it bears still upon it the broad signet-mark belonging to the Church of Christ—the true Church. Therefore, I say that, if I am a true son of that Church, I must take the deepest interest in every one of you; and I do trust I may say that I do so. This at least I can say that upon my conscience I believe there is no working man in this hall who works harder than I do. And I do from my heart desire to help every single one of my brethren present—not to-night only, but on all occasions. I say this, however, not from any good there is within myself, but because the system I am administering is a system which is meant to bring the good of this world to all the people belonging to the Church of Christ, and heartily to administer that good to them all. Therefore it is, that during the sittings of this Congress we have been talking a great deal about doctrines, and many other things which do not occupy your attention so much because you haven't time for them; but nevertheless, depend upon it, every one of these doctrines concerns yourselves. And if we can keep the central heart of this great spiritual institution—the Church—true in the midst of these troublous times, there is not one man in this wide Hall who will not be the better for the labours of the Church; whereas if we, its ministers, become effete, if we become humbugs, if we become unmeaning creatures, repeating by rote our formularies, there is not one man in this Hall but will be the worse for our becoming such. Therefore I beseech you to give a free, a hearty, and a listening ear to those who have undertaken to address you to-night.

Now, I am going to introduce the first of these—as true, as honest, and as eminently gifted a friend of the working man as there is in this our land of England —I mean the good Canon Kingsley. He is one to whom God has given very great abilities, and there is scarcely a greater proof of the completeness of the possession of such abilities than the strength of a loving sympathy for all co-existing with them. Depend upon it, that the mere brilliancy of the flash of forked lightning, bright as it is, is but a very poor thing to rest on. It is in the genial descents of fertilizing showers upon the earth that God's gift is pre-eminently to be traced; and if genius is bright as the lightning, true sympathy of feeling on the part of one man towards his fellow-men is above all other things the genial and the fertilizing shower. Now Canon Kingsley is such an one. He has not only great abilities, but he also has a heart capable of feeling for men who suffer; and I ask you to listen to his words. I shall sit down, heartily thanking you for the great attention you have given me; and now I shall call, with great confidence, upon my brother to address you.

The Rev. Canon KINGSLEY.

GENTLEMEN,—All I have to say is what I have always said to a meeting like this. There are two things strongly in my mind; or rather one thing,—science, divided into two parts: the first is what we call physical science, about which we were talking in Congress this morning, and about which I am always glad to talk to working men; and the next, political science. I was very glad to hear you respond so heartily to his lordship just now when he told you that you were all politicians. I hope you all are. I am a politician because I am a man—a civilized man, and not a savage. I do not care what politics you profess, so long as every one of you is a politician. But to understand what politics really are you must begin at the beginning. Any single political question is but a little sprig of the great tree whose roots are deep down in the soil of ages; and it is necessary to get at these in order rightly to understand the first constitution of man. Where I learnt my politics—as I used to tell my lads at Cambridge—was out of the Bible. I got my political principles out of the Old Testament; and I do not see how any man can read his Bible without finding politics there. What is the Bible all through but the political history of a nation,—showing how that nation at a very early period had a very excellent constitution given to it—how in some way or another the nation and its constitution did not agree—how it threw away its constitution and got into captivity for seventy years, experiencing one of the most terrible calamities which ever overtook a nation—how, after those seventy years of hard trial, it found out its mistake, got its constitution back again, and became one of the freest, most democratic, and most republican nations in the then known world—and how for some four hundred years, by keeping its constitution, it remained the noble little community which it had become? I trust there are some at least in this meeting who will understand me when I say that I do not give you a mere catch-word: but when I speak of a constitution, I speak of Moses's law. This people of the Jews found out the value of its constitution, law, and government; it kept them for a time, but it lost them again in a more dreadful manner than before. It kept them in the letter, but lost them in the spirit. The people pretended to be free, and said, "we are Abraham's children," when they were slaves, bigots, and hypocrites at heart; and they ended by tearing each other to pieces, and being destroyed by a dreadful destruction; and as a nation they are now scattered over the entire face of the earth. They are a people, however, not to be lost sight of. They have magnificent qualities in them, of which we shall hear more some day. But what I want you to bear in mind is, that the Bible is a book of politics; and that it is the political history of a nation. There are some—(I will not say infidels, because I hate the word; some of the noblest and purest spirits whom I have known as friends on earth are what I might dogmatically call infidels; and therefore I will never use a word of scorn towards any man who differs in opinion from me—but there are those who have sneered at the Bible because, as they say, it is the history of a small and obscure nation, of a small and insignificant tribe. Now I trust that working men are philosophers enough to perceive that they may have an example and a type of all humanity, in a single specimen; and that they may have an example of the laws, political and social, which affect humanity, in the history of one small, and (if the world chooses to call it so, though the world must be exceedingly blind to facts if it does) one such obscure nation as that of the Jews. This is what I consider my major premiss. My next is that the political creed of the Bible is a very curious one—particularly curious now, when it is almost extinct: but before there is anything like a good world it will have to be received and believed in again. The Bible theory of politics is this—that the politics of a nation depend upon its social state; and I am very glad to see all through what we should call the extreme party in England and the extreme party abroad, with which I have been very much mixed up, and with whom, in spite of all their mistakes, I have the greatest sympathy, because they have an idea, rightly or wrongly, and are ready to die for its maintenance—I say, the extreme party, call them the Red Republican party if you like; I do not belong to them myself—but still they are men whom I love because they have got hold of a grand idea; and though, as I believe, they have got hold of the tail instead of the head,—they have at all events got hold of it, and will be the better for it through time and eternity,—I am very glad to see, I say, that the opinion of the mass of working men in England is this—that common politics are inferior in importance to social ideas and social organization. I am glad to perceive from your expressions of assent that you too believe in this truth; because you are believing what is sound, honest, Bible doctrine.

Social institutions and social arrangements depend entirely upon morality; and morality is not a little thing that you may see flying about like a cherub, with "morality" labelled on its back. Morality means—I am moral or immoral; you are moral or immoral; he, she, or it is moral or immoral. And so the whole question of politics and of social arrangements comes down to the question,—Are you and I individually good or bad men and women?—because it comes down to the moral question, which must be a personal and an individual one. Now if you will go and read your Bibles, you will find that the political theory of the Bible is, that politics depend upon the social health, the social life, and the social character—the soul and body of every individual person. All other social theories are fallacious. I have read Sociology by the ream,—Tom Paine and the whole lot of them; and theories of politics I have also read by the ream, but they are a weariness of the flesh unto me, because they seem to me to be nothing in the world but exceedingly elaborate devices for getting something out of a jackass besides a bray; they are exceedingly elaborate devices for gathering grapes off thorns, and figs off thistles; for making the corrupt tree bring forth good fruit, contrary to what I consider very high authority indeed. "Make the tree good," from its root upward (and every single human being in this Hall is a part of the root of the great English tree),—"make the tree good, and the fruit will be good." If honest men, wise men, pure men, virtuous men, and free men make the roots of the tree good, then the fruits must and will be good;—the social arrangements will be good;—the relations between man and woman, between parent and child, between employer and employed, will all be good; and then out of that—not as the cause of it, but as the effect of it—(oh! I wish I could get that abominable theory of making the cart draw the horse beaten out of the heads of people)—as the effect, I say, and not as the cause of this, the political institutions of the country must become good. The political institutions of any country are simply the expression of the conscience of that country; and where the conscience, the heart, and the reason of a country are sound, the political institutions must be sound, just as the flower must be sweet, and pure, and lovely, whose roots are sound. Just as, if a man's heart and head be sound, he will have noble and clear thoughts and principles, which must come out sooner or later into distinct and definite formulæ, so the justice and nobleness of a country's laws will spring naturally from the justice and nobleness of its citizens. A nation's laws no more make the nation than a man's words make his heart.

Let me talk to you for a moment, as an honest man, about what you are all thinking of,—poor, dear, unhappy France at this moment! I have a right to speak somewhat about her; for, though I do not want to boast, I know the history of France, and the politics of France. They have been a special study of mine; and I know what genius she has in political science, in social science. But what has been the matter with France? This,—that while she has employed her magnificent genius in political affairs, and in affairs of society, she has not attended to the old Bible theory of personal morality. You may have what amount of intellect, of learning, of zeal, and of nobleness in as many senses as you will, in a country; but as long as the rampant passions of a country (forgive me, I do not want to speak hard of those who are so hard hit)—as long as the rampant passions of a country are such as would in any family, or in any parish, produce disunion, distrust, mutual hatred, and mutual fear—as long as envy and bitterness, as long as a want of reverence, as long as a fondness for the enjoyment of the moment; aye, as long as—(I must speak)—as long as adultery, which is the mother of all other sins, because it puts a whole society into a continual state of base desire, of base fear, of base distrust, and of base revenge:—as long as that—God forgive me, if I have spoken too harshly, but I know what I am talking about, and there is not a gentleman of the press, nor any educated man in this room, who does not know that what I am speaking is the truth—so long as these are the ruling passions of any country or society, what must happen? This,—that in spite of the most brilliant theories of liberty, the net result must be slavery, because slavery to the passions is slavery to the man who will pander to those passions; and when the pressure of that kind of slavery is removed, the whole nation must collapse into that worst anarchy which is produced by the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life; the anarchy which its own follies and crimes have been preparing for it. God forgive me (I say again) if I am speaking at all uncharitably; but I must say what I feel; and I give you my honour as a gentleman and a Christian, that what I now say to you is what I said to my own young men at Cambridge ten years ago. Even so far back as that, I predicted that some such dreadful catastrophe as that which has occurred would some day occur; but little did I dream that when it did occur, it would be so complete; or that the final plunge, when taken, would be so awful. It may be that France is going through this very depth of misery simply to learn the lesson which I entreat you to learn: that political prosperity, and social prosperity, aye, and even money prosperity, as much as anything else, depend, in the long run, upon the individual virtues of the individual members of a community. I tell you—though some of you may be inclined to laugh at me—you may be perfectly certain that the final cause for any event—social, or political, or commercial—is a moral cause. Morality is at the bottom of every human event. If we want the nation to be good and righteous, we should endeavour to be good and righteous ourselves. If you do not know how to be good men yourselves, you must find out the way. And if, like me, you are unable to be good men, though you know how, you must fall back on the only recipe that I have found to be of any use, and ask God to help you.

That is all I have got to say, and if I came here twenty times, I should just say the same.

The Right Rev. the PRESIDENT

THEN introduced the Lord Bishop of Peterborough, remarking that though his voice had not previously been heard in Southampton it had become familiar to the midland counties, although the period during which he had held a diocesan appointment in that part of the country was extremely short. Dr. Magee spoke the purest and hardest reasoning of almost any man whom he (the Bishop of Winchester) knew; and he had great pleasure in introducing his lordship to the meeting.

The Right Rev. the Bishop of PETERBOROUGH.

I AM very much obliged to you for so kind a welcome to so complete a stranger as I am amongst you. It is a very great encouragement to me to receive it, and at the same time it is a very great temptation to me. It is a very great encouragement to any speaker to receive a cheer when he rises to make his speech; and do not you believe any person who tells you that it is not, because it is. There is nothing that so powerfully impresses a speaker as the sight of such a multitude as this. But, as I have said, with the encouragement there comes a very great temptation to the speaker to lay himself out during his speech for a repetition of those cheers—to go on saying one thing after another which he thinks will particularly please his hearers—to be feeling the pulse of the meeting, and always angling for their cheers. That is a real and a serious temptation; and there is this further temptation; every speaker who likes a cheer dislikes a hiss. But then, you must remember that the man who is afraid of listening to a hiss is not worthy of a cheer. And therefore what you of all other things should desire in a public speaker is this—that he shall speak out honestly what he believes to be true, whether the meeting likes it or does not.

Now, I am not going to suppose that you won't like what I shall say. I hope you will, and that you will be good enough to cheer me when I sit down; but I tell you this, that I am going to say it, at any rate. Let me just, then, say this—that this very position in which I find myself—this desire of winning your hearty goodwill, and this dislike of your dislike, and the temptation to escape it, exactly represent the great temptation at this moment of the Church of which I am a minister in the presence of the masses of this country. What we should desire as ministers of Christ's Church, if we are faithful to our mission, is your hearty affection and confidence. What we naturally shrink from, as men as well as ministers, would be your dislike, or want of confidence. In this respect the Church is exposed—and when I speak of the Church, I speak more especially of the ministry—is exposed to a very great danger, is in danger of suffering very serious injury; and as you have already been told, you can inflict no injury, no moral degradation upon the teachers of religion without injuring those whom they have to teach. Therefore, it practically concerns you, that the ministers of Christ's Church in this country should be able to meet this danger and avoid this temptation.

Now let me put distinctly before you what I think is the great danger, the great temptation, to the spiritual ministry of the Church at this moment. And in order to do this, I must, like the preceding speaker, talk to you just a little politics. Let me say, first of all, what kind of politics I am going to talk about. Not a word of party politics will you hear from me to-night, because as a minister of Christ's Church—an older Church than the Church of England—I have nothing whatsoever to do with party politics. The Church of Christ has lived in this world for eighteen hundred years—has seen the rise and fall of many and many a political party, and will see the rise and fall of many, many another. Her dealings are not with the parties of men, but with humanity itself.

Well, then, I say what I have to talk to you about politics is not of party politics, but of the religious side of all politics. There may be, unhappily, a political side to religion, but most assuredly there is a religious side to politics, if you take politics to mean the duty of citizens to the state. Just a word, then, about politics in this light. I am going to tell you a fact with which you are perfectly well acquainted already, and that is, that for good or for evil, for right or for wrong—I don't say which—it is a fact that political power in this country is more and more vested—and is becoming and is likely to be still more vested —in the great masses of the nation. Now that is a fact. Well, then, I say you are becoming more and more the depositories of political power, and you are a distinct class or order in the nation. For that reason I say you are exposed to the danger which besets the possessors of all power; for whatever class you vest power in—whoever possesses power—is exposed to the danger of a selfish use of that power—a use for himself and not for others—a use for his class or order to the neglect or injury of all other classes. That was the fault of kings and emperors long ago. Do you know why? Not because they were kings and emperors, but because they were men, and for no other reason; and if you do away with a king or an emperor, and in place of him put one hundred, five hundred, or fifty thousand men, they will be men all the same; and those who tell you, and tell you truly, that kings and emperors are only flesh and blood like yourselves, forget to tell you the other side of the story, that you are flesh and blood as well as kings and emperors.

The danger, then, to which you or any other order are exposed, and should guard against, is a selfish regard for your own order or class and a forgetfulness of other classes. I do not say that you would be a bit worse, but I have no reason for prophesying that you would be one whit better, than any other class. Now what is the danger you are further exposed to? To the rankest and basest of flattery. Wherever you have power, there you have the selfish hangers-on of power. Wherever you set up power—wherever you have a court there you will have the courtier, cowering, cringing, scraping, lying, for his own gain. I do not care whether that court is in a gilded saloon or in the open square—wherever there is power, there is the flatterer.

The danger, therefore, which you are exposed to is a very serious danger—it is that of the rankest and most nauseous flattery of the thousands who are looking to you as the entire possessors of political power and the dispensers of political gain. And I maintain that the man who flatters the multitude is every inch as much of a flunkey as the man who flatters the monarch. I will give you an instance of this. There are plenty of instances to be found just now, but I will give you one which I met with the other day in a leading periodical. A man who professes to write to you, and who also professes to write for you and in your name (and you will find a great many people now willing to talk *for* you as well as *to* you), says that one of the things which you working men will shortly have to do is to "disband a sinister clerical army of twenty-eight thousand men in masks"—in masks, mind you. Now, I am not going to say one word about the good taste or the good feeling of that remark, because the gentleman who wrote, it may be, really believes the twenty-eight thousand English clergymen to be, every one of them, knaves and hypocrites. All I can say, in charity, in that case is, that I am afraid he has not been happy in the selection of his acquaintances out of the profession. But what I want you to mark is the utter flunkeyism of that sentence. This man praises you by dispraising others. Had he lived a hundred, or a hundred and fifty years ago, I can very well imagine him to be the man who would have worn a pig-tail, a straight sword, a short coat, and canary-coloured continuations, and who would have been seen scraping and bowing in the Court, and entreating the king or the emperor not to mind those hundreds of thousands of the mere lower classes.

Here then is an instance of precisely the danger to which you are exposed; and I ask—What is it that you most need under these circumstances? You tell me that the majority is to be king. Very well. I like a limited monarchy; but no matter. Well now, what is it that a king, of all other men, wants? He wants a truthful minister. He wants a servant who will have the courage to stand and look him in the face and tell him that his soul is his own, and that because of it he must not lay upon his soul the guilt of a lie or a baseness. That man would be the most useful minister and servant whom any one in power could have. Now, I ask you—what is the function of a minister of Christ? I ask you—what is the function of the Church of the living God? I tell you, that one of her very highest offices is this office of the prophet, whose mission it is to speak out the word of the living God in the face of the possessors of power, be they kings or emperors, or peoples—whether they will hear or whether they will forbear.

The word which the Church has for men, if she speak it faithfully, is the word of the living God. I am speaking of the Church as a spiritual body and am not talking of Establishments. And I say, therefore, of the Church and of the minister of Christ, that this is his function—that he testify against all evil, that he protest against all wrong and for all right—that he vindicate the right of the few against the many, or of the many against the few, as the case may be—that he stand up for truth, for justice, and for liberty, in the name of the living and eternal God, who created men that they might be free. And he does this in the name of a higher law and of a higher power than any on earth. "The powers that be are ordained of God." What is the meaning of that message? Not merely to teach us submission to force, but to teach us the power of duty—to teach the possessor of power that there is a mightier power than brute force, that there is a higher law than the breath of man can speak—even the eternal overruling will of the Great Judge, who is one day to call before His judgment-seat the ruler and the ruled. And it is in the name of that eternal law—it is in the name of that supreme and over-ruling Will—that the Church of Christ proclaims her message as she has proclaimed it for eighteen centuries to the nations of the world.

It was in the name of God's law and will that liberty was first demanded for an oppressed people. "Let my people go," was the demand of a people's champion long ago. What is the end of the sentence?—"Let my people go, that they may serve Me;" and it was their right to serve God that gave them the right to snap the shackles of the tyrant, who bid them serve him only. Well, then, I say it deeply concerns you in this nation—you, who are to be henceforth the possessors of political power—that there should be in this nation as it were an embodied conscience, fearless enough, bold enough, and truthful enough to tell you when you are doing wrong, and to proclaim, not in her own name, but in the name of her Great Master and yours, what it is right for you to do. I say, that the great idea which the Church has to teach men is the idea of duty; and she has to teach it to all classes, so that every man may feel—"It is for me to do my duty whether I rise high or sink low in the social scale; to recognise the great truth that wherever God's providence places me—if He leads me step by step from the lowest to the highest post in the country—it is for me to do my duty as in His sight and before His judgment seat, just because He and none other has placed me where I am." The Church, then, must be faithful to this her mission; and what is the danger of the Church? It is that she should forget her mission—that she should be unfaithful, untrue, servile, and supple to you who are in power. You will tell me, perhaps, what is but too true—that in centuries past, when power was wielded by other hands, the Church was too often servile and cringing to kings and emperors. She was so because the Church is composed of human beings, and because the inherent weakness of human nature is to become pliant and susceptible to the seductive influence of power; and for that very reason the temptation of the Church now is to be servile and cringing to those who have power, because it is in human nature now, as it always was, to aim at being in favour with the great. The great now are the multitude; and so, to get the ear of the multitude, to win praise in the leading article of the next day's newspaper, to be popular—of all things, and before all things, popular—this is our temptation now. Now if there be one thing more pitiful for you to see amongst you, and more mischievous than another, it is a set of popularity-hunting parsons. You talk sometimes about fox-hunting parsons. I know that in the midland counties there have been fox-hunting parsons, and there are perhaps a few still. But to my mind fox-hunting is not one-half so bad a thing as popularity-hunting. Believe me, nothing would so utterly degrade the Church as for its ministry to be always trying to say, not what was true, but what was pleasant—still "prophesying smooth things" and uttering deceits; forgetting that, when the prophet of old obeyed the people by humouring their desires, upon both prophet and people fell the righteous judgment of a truth-loving and lie-hating God. What is it, then, that you should desire above all things, and that we should desire for you? It is that the Church be thus honestly faithful to her mission,—for your sake, for her own sake, and for God's sake. The Church, as I have said, should be the embodied conscience of the nation; and woe to that nation, as woe to that man, whose mind and conscience are defiled. The ministers of that Church should claim to be with all their heart and mind the teachers of the nation in things spiritual. They should claim to teach from the very depths of their hearts those lessons which they have learned on their knees as well as out of their books, and to bring out of the cultivated store of their intellects, and the ripened experience of their hearts—tried by contact with suffering and with sorrow—things new and old—old as the Christ who came to save mankind, new as the freshly-rising needs, the sorrows and the sufferings of the day in which they live. This should be the work of the Church. She should claim to be this, and nothing less than this. And one thing more she should claim to be, as her direct right and privilege—the consoler of the multitude. It is her duty to speak harsh and stern truths at times—truths that are hard to be received; but it is also her duty to speak such words as He has given her to speak who came to be the *Christus Consolator*, the helper and the healer of the sorrowing humanity He has redeemed. Yes, my friends, this is the great work of the Church—really and truly to elevate the masses. We are told that it was intended they should rise, and that the masses may elevate themselves. It is a common clap-trap saying, that there is not one among such an assembly as this for instance, which is now listening to me, who may not rise to the highest offices in the State. That is quite true as far as the individual is concerned—there is nothing to hinder him; but then you must remember that as the number of offices is limited, it is pretty certain that every one here will not rise to high office—or perhaps to any office. Any man's son *may* be Lord Chancellor, but it is quite clear that only one man's son will be. And then I ask what is to become of the great masses of mankind who do not rise above their fellows—those who have not the resolute will, the strong constitution, or the active brain, which lift some few men above their fellows: what is to become of these? Are they to be lost as mere undistinguishable specks in the great mass, as mere rounded pebbles on the beach which the great waves of time and change and chance are ever rolling to and fro in their advancing and retiring surges? Is there nothing to be done for these, no hopeful consoling word to be spoken to those who never rise in this world, but who inevitably sink, by no fault of theirs, but by reason of that terrible grinding pressure of society which falls sometimes upon one and sometimes upon another, and crushes whomsoever it does fall upon to the earth as the stroke of the flail crushes the garnered corn? I ask, what is to be done for these men? Is there no word of kindness, no word of pity, no word of hope to be spoken to such as these? Yes, there is. The Saviour, who has said to us "Go ye and teach all nations," has also given us this other word to speak for Him, "Come unto me all ye that are weary and heavy laden, and ye shall find rest unto your souls." It is in the name of that Saviour that we go forth to address you. It is to that Saviour that with weak, and erring, and, God knows, with trembling and sin-defiled—yet I do testify to you, with loving hands, we desire to draw you, that you may win the blessing He has to give, and that so amidst the restlessness of the world there may be still His rest—amidst the strife of the world still His peace, as you and we together work our little day in this life, and weave it into the work of all the ages—the work of Christ and the work of God.

THOMAS CHAMBERS, Esq., Q.C., M.P.

GENTLEMEN,—You have listened with much pleasure to addresses from two clergymen on this platform, who have spoken to you with great fidelity and with great power. I shall not follow in the line which they have taken with so much ability, but I shall call your attention, to some extent perhaps, to a different class of considerations. We are assembled here at Southampton at the sittings of the Church Congress. It is the first Church Congress that I have ever attended, and I have been so well pleased with it that I am not by any means sure it will be the last. I have, however, attended other Congresses. They are the fashion now. I have attended many meetings of the Social Science Association, which, as you know, has for its object the general improvement of the social arrangements of the people of the country, and I hope it has done some good. Then the British Association for Science has a Congress every year; and what I want to point out to you, is the thought that strikes us when we remember that these Congresses have come into fashion—what a vast distinction there is in this respect between the present times and the times that are past!

The distinction to which I wish to draw your attention is this, that in former times truth and knowledge were the property of a class or a clique, and that in modern times truth and knowledge have become the property of the whole people. Not that they are all equally capable of pursuing scientific and philosophical studies and investigations, but that those who do pursue them, in every achievement which they make, come before the public, and lay bare the results of it. And I heartily congratulate those who pursue science, and literature, and art, and philosophy, as heartily as I congratulate the people of England upon the change which has taken place in this respect.

I have no faith in the advantages of knowledge which is the property of a clique. I have no belief in the perpetuity or safety of truth, if it is committed simply to a class. But I have entire confidence in its perpetuity as truth, and in its usefulness as knowledge, the moment it is made the property of the whole people.

Hundreds and thousands of years ago a small discovery in mechanism or in chemistry was made, which might have been of great use to the people. But how was it employed? Merely as a piece of jugglery; and what should have been a power through which the people might have been raised and helped, was made simply a platform of chicane upon which they were deluded and degraded. And why? Because the discovery was kept in the hands of a few as a secret, and was not disclosed to the multitude. And so it is with regard to truth, moral and spiritual.

Canon Kingsley spoke to you with great force of the Jews as a people, and of the polity under which they lived; and told you that that polity included the open declaration of moral and spiritual truth to all the people. This Congress is a Church Congress. The word congress implies that we have differences, and that we are met to discuss them; and I want to talk about them. They are not—they ought not—to be masked. This Congress has met to discuss these differences—differences, not on the most momentous of all subjects, upon which we have no differences; but upon subjects that come close to the most important, and relate to the machinery that is employed about them. These are differences not to be shut up, disguised, or denied, but to be brought forth; and by bringing them forth and talking about them among ourselves, we help to heal our differences, and to discover, from the varying opinions expressed, what it is that would be best for the one great object we all have in view.

No man has truth without error. No man can say that he sees the whole truth clearly and fully from his own stand-point. No man is entitled to say that he sees the whole of truth. Let him ask his neighbour how he views truth from his stand-point, and in what light it presents itself to him. Let us consult one another's varying views; and then by comparing these, it may be that out of the combination we may be able to say that, as a nation, we have substantially arrived at the whole truth for every practical purpose.

No doubt there may have been, and are still, serious questions started by scientific men that touch very much what is supposed to be the meaning of certain passages in the Bible. Are these things to be concealed? Not at all. They are to be openly discussed and spoken of, without terror or apprehension. Every man here who delights to believe the Scriptures to be the foundation of everything he has to hope for, may look without any fear or apprehension at the difficulties that have been and will be started. The great thing is, that any man pursuing truth in any career, should pursue it with an honest and a straightforward intention and purpose. Two truths cannot really be opposed to each other, for that is a contradiction in terms. Every man in this country who hears of the controversies going on may hear of them with perfect tranquillity. He may hear scientific lectures which state frankly the results of experimental science and observation, and he may feel perfectly certain that the grounds of his faith will never be in the least degree affected by the results of science and speculation.

I rejoice to meet the men of Southampton at this evening gathering; and I do earnestly trust that, when you remember the distinction which I have been pointing out—that truth of all kinds is now made public property, you will also remember that Christian truth, which is the thing that brings us together, is in your own hands to keep. It is not that I want to talk Low Church even in a single sentence; but I do say—what the right rev. bishops on the platform will agree with me in saying—that Christian truth in this country is the property of the whole people. For the ministry nobody can be too thankful. Their services are of incalculable value, and among them are many learned men who devote their time and talents to the elucidation of truth for the benefit of others. But the people themselves are to maintain that truth. They are to remember what is said in Holy Writ—He that hath My word—hath it in his head, hath it in his heart, hath it in his life, hath it in his memory, hath it in his affections—he that hath My word—what is he to do with it? Forget it? Neglect it? Let it lie idle in his memory? No. "*Let him speak My word faithfully*"—speak it with his lips, with such force, and ability, and power as God may give him—speak it in his life, as Canon Kingsley said; as a *man* in his conduct to his wife, to his children, to his neighbours; as a *citizen* of the state: in all capacities, speak it out with fidelity and fearlessness—not attempting to hide his own deficiencies—above all things, not pretending to believe more than he does believe; but having the courage to be honest in the expression of it.

If a man doubts, I reverence a man who deals honestly with his doubts. I should like him to believe the whole truth; but if a man doesn't believe all that I believe, let him hold honestly what he does, and deny honestly what he doesn't. The honesty of the man will be his best help towards a full belief. And what he does honestly believe, let him honestly carry out. A man will lose his very faith if he is not just and honest to it in carrying it into constant practice. Every man will run the risk of losing his faith and moral feeling in proportion as he allows his conduct to belie them; whereas, both will be stirred up and will attain to a higher degree of perfection in proportion as his conduct is consistent with his own sense and feeling, with the views he has adopted, and with what he knows of that which God has given us in His Divine revelation. I do most earnestly hope that you will assist one another in declaring God's word faithfully so far as you have received it, and I am quite sure that, in proportion as you do declare it faithfully, you will understand and appreciate it.

The Rev. W. R. Clark, Taunton.

My Friends,—You have this evening listened to some very high and lofty thoughts spoken to you in very eloquent language; and I doubt not that you have all understood the words spoken, though at the same time some of you, like myself, may have found some difficulty in rising to the height of the thoughts expressed. In speaking to you, I have the advantage of being—not a great statesman or a ruler in the Church, but a plain parish Clergyman—a hard-working man, accustomed to do just some such work as this; and I propose to speak to you some such words as I am accustomed to speak to my own people.

When I thought of addressing a multitude of working men, it struck me that it would be hardly possible to speak to them about the greatness and the dignity of labour without seeming to flatter them; but I feel this—that we shall never flatter men, except by speaking a part only of the truth. If we speak the whole truth, as we understand it and believe it, we shall never flatter anybody; and therefore if, when you listen to me, any words which I may say should seem to approach the verge of flattery, I hope I shall convince you, before I finish, that I stood up for some other reason than to flatter you. I entirely agree with the sentiment expressed by a writer of our own times, that there are two classes of men, and two only, who are deserving of honour: first the men who work with their hands, and then those who work with their heads and their hearts. I believe Almighty God has ordained that everything which is great and useful in this world shall be attained by hard work. All great men have been great workers. Great rulers, great bishops, great statesmen, great generals, have all been great workers, and have all attained eminence by hard work; and I doubt whether in this case there exists so much as the exception which is said to prove the rule. But what I wish especially to say to you is this—and I almost wish that in saying it I were speaking to a lower *stratum* of the working classes than is represented by those I see around me,—for I fear we have got here rather the better class of working men, the better clad and the better paid class—I wish that almost the poorest class were here, that I might say to them what has been implied many times to-night by previous speakers, but not spoken in so many words, –that any man doing honestly and faithfully any kind of work which, in that state of life which he occupies, is imposed upon him, is doing as great and as dignified a work as though he were ruling an empire.

I have the highest respect for those who sit on the episcopal bench, and I believe that respect is fully deserved; and yet I dare to say to you, that the man who labours with his hands, in his shirt-sleeves, is doing a work quite as dignified and as noble in the sight of Almighty God—though perhaps it may not be so important—as long as he is doing it according to the will of God, and in obedience to the dictates of his conscience. I believe almost anything may be done by hard work, especially if it is sustained by right principle and directed by ordinary prudence; and the man who works hard in his own vocation, and who is not only a good servant, but a good father, a good husband, and a good neighbour,—he has no need to crave for a higher place, unless God should call him to it; and he may live on earth and go to the unseen world with a sense of having fulfilled his mission, and done his duty to his fellow-man. It is necessary, however, that I should remind you, while speaking of the greatness and importance of labour, of some of the difficulties and the dangers with which we are beset. One of these, I think, is a want of humility. Don't imagine that I mean to say the clergy are free from that vice any more than all other men are. But I do say this: that we are all of us in danger of forgetting that cardinal virtue of human life; we are all in danger of forgetting that the Christian man ought also to be a humble man. It is this which is the distinguishing character, not only of the Christian, but of the gentleman; and every working man may be as true and real a gentleman as any nobleman in the land. The man who respects himself, who is modest in his bearing among his fellow men, who has considerate and kindly feelings towards his friends and brethren, is a gentleman. But whilst both the gentleman and the Christian ought to be a humble man, we are sometimes apt to forget that the workman ought also to be a humble man. We imagine that certain graces belong to one portion of life, and forget that they ought to belong to all life. It is not difficult for you or me to be religious in our closets, when the sense of some sin causes us to cry for mercy to God—when the sense of some great favour bestowed fills our hearts with gratitude. Religious emotion is then, perhaps, not difficult; but it is difficult for us to go forth into the world, and to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with the Lord our God. Now, it seems to me that it is by no means always easy for the workman, who goeth forth to his labour from the morning until the evening, to preserve a humble mind; and you do yourselves much wrong when you think that a man is a less earnest and a less strong man because he is humble. Who is the really strong man? Is it the forward, and the bold, and the perky man—the man who is always thrusting himself into prominence at every opportunity—or the man who goes forward calmly, steadily, and quietly, thinking of his work and not of himself? I know what your answer will be. You know that, generally speaking, the strong man is the humble man, and the humble man the strong man. I believe, if we could bring up the greatest names in history, and trace out the characters of those who bore them, we should find that the greatest men had always been the most humble men.

May I tell you of One who was man, but who was more than man; and who, with strength greater than a giant's, had more than the tenderness of the fondest mother—before whom the strongest soldiers fell to the ground with awe, and yet to whose embrace the little children clung, that they might receive His blessing? Surely with His example, and the teachings of history before you, I need not stay longer to prove that strength and humility may and should go together.

There is one other thing which I have to speak to you about, and that is the spirit of prayer. As a Clergyman, I am not able to speak to you about politics as could a statesman, but I can and must speak to you of this. There is going about at the present day some sort of opposition to the doctrine of prayer. I do not say that it is found in a well-ascertained form; but some have an idea that science is opposed to prayer, and that the sequence of cause and effect, and all that kind of thing, excludes prayer. I am sure, however, you will admit this: that science has never pretended to say that prayer is without its value. All that science can say is, and all that science does say is, that it has no tests wherewith to discover prayer in the atmosphere—no scales by which to ascertain the weight of prayer, no measures by which to mete the results of prayer. That is all it can say. It simply stands aside and says, "This is not my province." I ask you whether against this, which is no testimony, you are prepared to abandon the positive testimony of those who have felt themselves refreshed and encouraged to do their work by the strength they have derived from the power of God made manifest through prayer. I will say further, that there is no working man who ever lived, who has made it his constant habit to begin the day with prayer, who has not felt himself calmed and soothed and strengthened to go forth to his work, and who has not felt that he has thus brought together his energies and collected his forces, in order to do that work to which God may have called him. But one other thing I must say. I should ill discharge my duty to you as working men, and my duty as a working man to Him who is my Master, if I did not remind you that you need more than guidance; you need a guide. You need more than deliverance; you need a deliverer. And surely there is One who can teach you, silently and without speech, all these things, far better than any human voice—your Lord and my Lord, the Son of God and the Son of man, who is at once the example of earnest labour, of deep humility, and of fervent prayer. In the words already spoken to you, you heard in another form what I am saying to you now—that no politics and no morality will be worth much to you, nor will you be capable of much in respect to either, unless you take Him for your Guide; for it is He that can teach you the good and the right way, and how to walk in it,—that will not only help and sustain you in your strength and vigour, but when the strong arm is paralysed, and manhood's strength shall subside into childish weakness, then that strong hand shall be present to guide you into the better land, and to give you work to do for Him,—work which will never weary, and the strength to do it which will never faint.

The Rev. J. Moorhouse.

My Friends,—In answer to your enquiry, I may say that I have endeavoured to promote the education of working-men ever since (many years ago) I became a curate in Sheffield. But I have come here to speak about a very important subject, and not about myself or my work, which are less than nothing. You have been listening to most interesting addresses, and very valuable ones too, and I was very much struck with the last words spoken to you by Canon Kingsley, who in a few touching words just before he sat down asked, "Where am I to get help to do what I know to be right?" He answered his question by saying, "I must seek it from God." Now I say, the most important question for you and me—far more important than the great political and social problems that have been touched on their outside to-night—is this one question, "When I want strength to do that moral duty which is at the base of all individual dignity and of all political progress, can I get it if I apply to God for it?" Now I am here to tell you what little I know about the means whereby you can get it, and the evidence to show that it can be had. Some of you, I dare say, may have heard of a very remarkable man who some years ago was a working man—Thomas Cooper by name—and if you have heard him, I have no doubt you have heard him construct that wonderful bridge of evidence, which, with its eighteen arches spans the whole abyss of time from our day up to the day of our Lord Jesus Christ. And you know that he put in, as the keystone of each of these arches, one fact well established and received by scholars and historians, which implied the existence in each of those centuries of the power of the Christian faith. That is a specimen of external evidence. But I don't believe that working-men will ever get by such evidence a living undoubting conviction that whenever they go to the throne of God and ask for strength they can obtain it.

I am going to tell you of a kind of evidence which I believe each man can test for himself. The Lord Jesus Christ told us that He ascended to the right hand of power to shed forth upon His people the gift of the Holy Ghost; and He told us that if we came in His name and asked for that gift without wrath or doubting, we should assuredly obtain it. Now I say that any of you can come and see for himself whether in this matter God is as good as His word. You will know what I mean, when I tell you, by way of illustration, the story of a man who sought and found the thing of which I am speaking. That man was in great sorrow and perplexity of spirit. He had learned to love the Lord Jesus and he loved Him so dearly that he thought it became him to be a minister of Christ and to speak of the loveliness and power of His grace to all mankind. But he felt, as many of you I have no doubt do, that he hadn't that certainty in the matter which would enable him to go and say to every man, "Come to Christ, and He will give you what you seek." And therefore he did that which I am going to recommend to you. He went to the Word of God, to see upon what conditions he could expect to get what was promised; and he found there that though God would not give him everything he asked for—that although he might ask things which were not good for him, which the loving Father would never give to him, and which it would be best for him should be denied to him,—yet there was one thing distinctly and absolutely promised, which if he prayed for in the right spirit, he had a right to expect he would receive. And that was the only thing which that man wanted. He wanted the power and life which would enable him to become that which he saw Christ to be—that spirit of power which would make him like Jesus. He went to the throne of God believing the promise, "If ye being evil know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Heavenly Father give His Holy Spirit to them that ask Him?" He asked for it day after day, and he asked it with continually increasing spiritual earnestness. He asked it one day with peculiar energy—with an agony of longing,—and though the night began with darkness it ended with light. God came to the man's heart, and he knew that God came to him, for he was filled with supernatural joy and supernatural power; and though he cannot tell you what the thing is because it is unutterable, he can tell you the effects of it. They established in the man's soul a love of God and of Christ before the intenseness of which all human affections became pale. They established in his soul a hatred of sin so intense that it seemed to him he would be thenceforth separated from it for ever. They established in his soul a love of man so intense that he felt he could take all men for his brethren; and gave him a taste of the blessedness of which he read in his Bible. Now I say that this was of God. It may not be given to every man to experience such direct revelation of God's power. It may be that He will come to other men in a different way, stealing rather into their hearts as a whisper of love, than coming to them in the lightning and the earthquake. But He will come to the soul of every man really and substantially who comes and asks for the gift of His Holy Spirit in the name of Christ. And I tell you that the man that has that evidence has the assurance of the presence of God directly speaking to his heart, as distinctly as the evidence of his sight tells him that his hand is before him. And though it may be that the exceeding brightness of that light fades afterwards into the light of common day, and the man is left to walk at times in the valley of humiliation, sensible of his unfaithfulness, till that life is articulated into the human life of which he is the possessor, until it makes him in some measure humble and lowly like his Lord; yet when a man has had his nature so spiritualized and permeated with the Divine power, he possesses an inward assurance of communion and fellowship with God; and then also everything in the nature of questionings and objections vanish entirely away, and if every man on earth doubted, that man could never doubt again that there is a living God in the heaven above, and that when truly and spiritually sought He manifests Himself to the hearts of His people. And then, if a man knows this truth, oughtn't he to tell it? If the Lord Jesus has redeemed a man's soul and put His Spirit into his heart, oughtn't the man to testify of the grace of that loving Redeemer? Isn't he a traitor unless he does? And what if it is not with you as it once was:—still that evidence having once been vouchsafed to you is evidence to you for evermore. Having received it, you can never fear for Christ's Church again. That is impossible. Christ's Church is the home and temple of Christ's Spirit; and if any man knows this experimentally that the Omnipotent God is in the hearts of His people, though all the earth should stand on one side of the line, and that individual man stood alone on the other side—though he feels his weakness, though he knows his unfaithfulness—that man could not doubt for a moment! He had seen heaven opened, and knowing that the omnipotence of the glorified Christ was behind him, he would be sure that by His single arm alone, were there no other to strike, the Spirit of God could smite to the earth all the power of the enemy. I tell you that for the Church of Christ to fear, is an impossibility, because she has the sense, yea the *certainty*, that the Spirit of her glorified Lord is within her. And, my friends, it shall be my parting word for I came rather to speak to men who were seeking the way to life than to any others; it shall be my parting word,—if there be those humble Christians among you of whom Mr. Chambers spoke, who have the love of Christ in their hearts, and have experienced the manifestation of the Spirit's grace, I entreat them to testify the fact to their friends around them, for it behoves every man who has received the gift of God to declare it openly and boldly, knowing that the Lord will be ashamed of those who are ashamed of Him; and knowing that no man can be honest, who will not stand forth now for the Saviour, to proclaim that the Name which is so often maligned, is nevertheless a Name that is above every name. Let him say, "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain, to receive power, and dominion, and strength, and all of blessing and of praise that can be given by saints and angels for ever and ever."

The Right Rev. PRESIDENT then pronounced the Benediction, and the vast assembly dispersed.

APPENDIX.

THE following circular to Principals of Training Colleges is here given, to show that the anticipations expressed in Mr. Ashwell's paper (see page 96) were not unfounded. No examination in religious knowledge will take place henceforward.

"*Education Department Whitehall,*"

"SIR,

I HAVE the honour to forward copies of the Syllabus for 1871.

You will observe that the examination in religious subjects has been omitted. Their Lordships have felt themselves called upon to make this change in the Syllabus, in order to bring it into conformity with the principles affirmed by Parliament, last session, in the Elementary Education Act.

I am, etc.,
F. R. SANDFORD."

p. 229, line 11.

The Council of Laodicea, which ruled that no person below the rank of a deacon should come within the altar rail, is the same that fixed the canon of Holy Scripture.

p. 313.*

"Anglis autem non aliud lumen affulsit quam Germanis et Belgis, Danis et Suecis, Polonis et Hungaris, et populis qui in circuitu sunt uspiam omnibus. Nec novum illud, quum antiquum, quodque prius fuerat (interveniente tantum crepusculo et noctiluca vestra) aliquantisper in umbra terræ detentum."—*Ad Card. Bellarminum Apolog. Resp.* p. 543. Lib. A.C. Th., vol. V.

p. 313.†

Keble says in his Preface to Hooker's Works :—"Nearly up to the time when he [Hooker] wrote, numbers had been admitted to the ministry of the Church of England, with no better than presbyterian ordination" (p. lxxvi.). The same was still the case far later, according to Bishop Cosin, who asserts that the reordination of a foreign pastor not episcopally ordained had been "never yet done in the Church of England but in Mr. Dury's case alone, and that upon his own desire and pretence of conscience" (Works, L. A. C. Th. Vol. IV., p. 450). Bishop Fleetwood gives as instances of non-episcopally ordained foreigners admitted into the ministry of the Church of England before the Restoration; Whittingham, ordained at Geneva, presented to the deanery of Durhan ; Travers, ordained by a presbytery at Antwerp, preacher at the Temple in Hooker's time; Morison, ordained by presbyters (?) in Scotland, licensed by Archbishop Grindal. Proceedings were instituted against Whittingham, which might have ousted him, had he not died while they were pending; and Hooker's exceptions to Travers are well known;

but nothing seems to have been said against Morison. Other instances of this allowance of non-episcopal ordination have been recorded: thus Bishop Cosin names Dr. Delaune, who with only a presbyterian ordination received at Leyden was deemed admissible to an English benefice by Overall.

But these indulgences or connivances were all along contrary to the plain letter of our law, *e.g.* as expressed in the preface to the Ordinal as it stood even from 1549. Archdeacon Robert Wilberforce says: "The matter, however, seems to have been otherwise understood; and when this Act (relating to the Ordinal *inter alia*) was renewed in the 1st year of Elizabeth, those who had been ordained abroad in Queen Mary's reign were supposed to be already priests and deacons. Still, as respected the future, there was no real opening made for similar irregularities. The precedent, however, which had been set, seems to have led to them; and apparently with a view of obviating any further doubts, without the appearance of an *ex post facto* law, an Act was passed, 13th Elizabeth, c. 12. . . . Those who had been ordained abroad during Mary's reign were not expressly recognised [by this Act], though a sort of implied sanction is given them; but forasmuch as every one from that time was to subscribe the Articles, each person must needs bind himself to a declaration that for the future no mode of ordination but the episcopal was to be employed in the Church" ("Church Courts and Church Discipline." London: 1843, p. 98).

p. 313.||

"It was not till the epoch of the Restoration that the principles of Anglicanism were fully recognised by Convocation and accepted by Parliament" (Dean Hook's Discourse on Controversies of the Day, p. 32).

p. 313. §

I mean the "Schoolmen." "Not only Armachanus, a very learned and worthy bishop, but as it appeareth by Alexander of Hales, many learned men, in his time and before, were of opinion that, in some cases and in some times, presbyters may give orders, and that their ordinations are of force, though to do so, not being urged by extreme necessity, cannot be excused" (Field, "Of the Church," Book iii. Chap. 39).

According to Froude, a Pope once sent into England (I think he says into the diocese of St. Asaph) a person not in bishop's orders, bearing from him a commission to ordain!

p. 315.*

"I have the proofs in my hands, that the Court of Rome fully approved the articles of the Augsburgh Confession."—Letter by Bergenroth to D. Douglas, in Mr. Cartwright's "Gustave Bergenroth; A Memorial Sketch."

Saravia, according to Casaubon, wished the adoption of this Confession by other Reformed churches besides. "Saravia affirmeth constantly that Beza, in the conference at Poissy (1561) committed two grave errors; first, because, when he was asked whether he were willing to subscribe the Confession of Augsburgh, he said 'No'; and thought himself a very clever man for meeting the Romanists and stopping their mouths with the answer, 'Do ye subscribe the Confession of Augsburgh first, and we will put our names after yours.' Saravia finds very grave fault, both with the refusal, and with the manner of it" (Quoted from Casaubon, in Archdeacon Denison's edition of "Saravia on the Holy Eucharist," *p*. 23).

p. 317. ‡

. . . "tutius quidem puto presbyteros Reformatarum Ecclesiarum accipere s. ordinem ab Episcopis, seu Anglicanis seu Pontificiis, si qui Reformationi subscripserint, quam a Presbyteris, et multo minus a Laicis, ut adsit vera et propria successio, et cum Apostolis colligatio: extraordinariam vero vocationem ministrorum non potui meo l. 2, c. 2, n. 56 et seqq. nullo modo admittere et approbare, sed interim neque eam damno absolute. Sed multis nominibus Ecclesiis Reformatis profuturum censeo, si in singulis saltem provinciis unum Episcopum rite ordinatum haberent cum ordinaria antiqua episcopali jurisdictione, qui et clerum totius provinciæ in ecclesiasticis regeret, et ministros ordinaret, quia Ecclesiæ sine Episcopis nunquam potuerunt esse. Neque eas terreat Bellarminus dum objicit: eorum episcopos non successuros in Episcopatu antiquis Episcopis, quia urbes multæ in quibus Reformata viget religio, habuerint olim, et habuerint hodie proprios Episcopos Catholico-Romanos, in quibus stat vera successio. Docui enim supra (n. 49 hujus capitis) non omnes veros episcopos aliis episcopis succedere; ut ubi novi eriguntur episcopatus, vel ubi episcopus episcopo accedit et non succedit; et ut legitimus sit episcopus, satis est si legitime ordinatur, vel a tribus episcopis catholicis jure ecclesiastico, vel ab unico jure evangelico. Neque est necesse ut ordinatus suo succedat ordinatori. . . . Et quidem superordinatio, ubi adest legitimus episcopus, ordinarie non est sine schismate, si eo invito fiat, ut jam docui (n. 74); sed ubi Reformati a suo ordinario episcopo abjecti sunt, quibus ille sacra renuit ministrare, quando illi schisma non fecerunt, causa est legitima ut proprium haberent Episcopum propriosque ministros orthodoxos, et a schismate alienos. Sunt autem plures occasiones, quæ duorum episcoporum Catholicorum in eadem civitate et particulari ecclesia justam reddant ordinationem, ut jam non semel docui præcedentibus."—*De Republ. Eccl.*, lib. vii., cap. 10, § cxcv.

p. 324.

The letter of Archbishop Laud to Cyril Lucar (from the Library at Williamscote, Oxon.), is here given, by kind permission of the owner, the Rev. Thomas Loveday.

Epistola Gulielmi Archiep. Cantuar. ad Cyrillum Lucar, Patriarch. Constantinopol. (*Anno* 1636.)

Τῷ θεοφιλεστάτῳ καὶ εὐσεβεστάτῳ ΚΥΡΙΛΛΩ, ἐλέει Θεοῦ τῆς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, νέας Ῥώμης, Ἐπισκόπῳ, ὑπερτίμῳ Ἐξάρχῳ, οἰκουμενικῷ Πατριάρχῃ, καὶ τῷ κοινῷ τῆς Καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας εὐεργέτῃ.

Ταύτην τὴν πρὸς Κορινθίους ἐπιστολὴν, μόνην τῶν περιφερομένων τοῦ ἁγίου Κλήμεντος γνησίαν καὶ ἀναμφίβολον, τοῖς Ῥωμαίοις ἅμα καὶ Κορινθίοις διὰ πολλῶν αἰώνων ἄγνωστον, τῇ βαθείᾳ λήθῃ παραδεδομένην, καὶ παντελῶς ἀπολωλυῖαν, δὶ ἐπιμελείας δὲ τῆς σῆς ἁγιωσύνης, ἀγαθῇ τύχῃ εἰς κοινὸν τῆς Ἐκκλησίας ἀγαθὸν τεχθείσης, καὶ ἐξαιρέτου κηδεμονίας, σεσωσμένην, καὶ πρὸ τριῶν ἐτῶν πρὸς τὸ κοινωφελὲς τῆς ὅλης ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ἀδελφότητος, ἐν τῇ περιβοήτῳ τῆς Ὀξονίας Ἀκαδημίᾳ ἐκδεδομένην, εἰς τὸ ἀδιάλειπτον, διὰ τοσαύτην καὶ τηλικαύτην εὐεργεσίαν, εὐχαριστίας μνημόσυνον, καὶ τῆς ἀεὶ καὶ ἀνυποκρίτου φιλίας καὶ φιλαδελφίας τεκμήριον, σὺν ἀσπασμῷ ἐν φιλήματι ἁγίῳ, ἀσμένως πέμπει, καὶ τῆς βραδείας διακομιδῆς συγγνώμην αἰτεῖ

ΙΛΕΡΜΟΣ, τῷ αὐτῷ ἐλέει Καντουαρίας Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος, Ἔξαρχος, καὶ Μητροπολίτης πασῆς τῆς Ἀγγλίας, καὶ τῆς ἐν τῇ Ὀξονίᾳ Ἀκαδημίας Καγκελλάριος.

In making search for the above interesting letter of Laud to Cyril Lucar, the following from the same to the same, and very similar to the former in character, has been met with in the Bodleian Library, and is here given as another exemplification of something more than mere courtesy that passed between the Church of England and the Eastern Church in the 17th century. Archdeacon Churton, however, thinks it doubtful whether this letter, and the present which it was to accompany, namely, the "Textus Jobi," ever reached Cyril, as he was put to death in June of the following year, 1638.—Ed.

Epistola altera, sive Inscriptio, Gulielmi Archiep. Cant. ad Cyrillum, Patriarch. Constantinopol. (*Anno* 1637.)

Τῷ θεοφιλεστάτῳ Κυρίλλῳ, ἐλέει Θεοῦ τῆς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, νέας Ῥώμης, Ἐπισκόπῳ, ὑπερτίμῳ Ἐξάρχῳ, οἰκουμενίκῳ Πατριάρχῃ, καὶ τῷ κοινῷ τῆς Καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας εὐεργέτῃ.

Τοῦ πολυταλάντου ἐκείνου δώρου καὶ τιμαλφεστάτου κειμηλίου, πρὸ ὀλίγων ἐτῶν παρὰ τῆς σῆς ἁγιωσύνης πρὸς τὸν γαληνότατον καὶ σεϐασμιώτατον βασιλέα ἡμῶν διαπεμφθέντος, ταύτην τὴν μερίδα, τὸ κειμένον δηλαδὴ τοῦ πολυάθλου Ἰὼϐ ὡς πρόδρομον ἐπίδειγμα τῶν λοιπῶν τῆς παλαίας διαθήκης βιϐλίων πάλαι μὲν ἐπὶ Πτολεμαίου τοῦ φιλαδέλφου ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ βασιλεύσαντος διὰ τῶν ἑϐδομήκοντα ἑρμηνευτῶν ἐκ τῶν Ἑϐραϊκῶν εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα γλῶσσαν μεταϐληθέντων, νῦν δὲ ἐξ αἰχμαλωσίας τῆς Αἰγυπτίας ἢ Βαβυλωνίας πολὺ χαλεπωτέρας καὶ μακροχρονιωτέρας ἐλευθερωθέντων, καὶ μετὰ πολλὰς αἰώνων περιόδους ἐκ τῆς σκιᾶς τῆς λήθης δεύτερον τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ διὰ τῆς ἀξιεπαινέτου τῆς ἁγιωσύνης σου ἐπιμελείας καὶ κηδεμονίας ἀποδεδομένων, καὶ ἐν βραχεῖ σὺν Θεῷ εἰς φῶς καὶ ἡμέραν ἐκδοθησομένων, εἰς τὸ ἀδιάλειπτον, διὰ τοσαύτην καὶ τηλικαύτην εὐεργεσίαν, εὐχαριστίας μνημόσυνον, καὶ τῆς ἀεὶ καὶ ἀνυποκρίτου φιλίας καὶ φιλαδελφίας τεκμήριον, σὺν ἀσπασμῷ ἐν φιλήματι ἀγάπης, ἀσμένως πέμπει

ΙΛΕΡΜΟΣ *τῷ αὐτῷ ἐλέει Καντουαρίας Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος, Ἔξαρχος καὶ Μητροπολίτης πάσης τῆς Ἀγγλίας, καὶ τῆς ἐν τῇ Ὀξονίᾳ Ἀκαδημίας Καγκελλάριος.*

LIST OF MEMBERS.

Those whose names are printed in Italics were readers or speakers.

A

Abbott, Miss
Acheson, Mr.
Acton, Rev. J.
Addenbrooke, Rev. E.
Ady, Archdeacon
Ady, Miss
Aldridge, Miss
Aldridge, W.
Alexander, Rev. A. B.
Allen, Rev. F. E.
Allen, Rev. R.
Alley, F. A.
Allnutt, Rev. W.
Allnutt, Mrs.
Amos, Rev. J.
Andrews, T. R.
Andrews, Rev. W. G.
Arnold, Rev. Dr.
Arnold, Rev. F.
Arnold, Rev. R. S.
Asaph, Dean of St.
Ash, Rev. D.
Ash, Mrs. D.
Ashwell, Rev. A. R.
Aslatt, H. P.
Atkins, E.
Atkins, Mrs.
Atkinson, Rev. J. B.
Atkinson, Rev. P.
Austen, Miss F. M.
Austin, Mr.
Austin, Miss
Awdry, Sir J.
Aylen, Mr.
Ayre, J. W.

B

Bailey, W.
Baines, Rev. J.
Baines, Mrs. J.
Baker, Rev. Talbot
Baker, Mrs. T.
Baldock, W.
Baldock, Mrs.
Baldock, Miss
Baldock, Miss K.
Balston, Rev. C.
Banister, G.
Bard, Rev. P.
Bardsley, Rev. J.
Barling, Mr.
Barling, Miss
Barnes, F. D.
Barnes, Rev. J.
Barr, Rev. N. H.
Barr, Rev. T.
Barrett, Miss
Barrow, Rev. J. S.
Barrow, Rev. G. S.
Barrow, Mrs. G. S.
Barry, Rev. C. U.
Bartlett, Rev. H. C.
Bartlett, Mr.
Bartlett, Mrs.
Barton, A.
Barton, Mrs.
Barton, Miss
Barton, Miss H.
Barwell, Rev. A. H. S.
Baseley, Mr.
Bassett, R. G.
Bassett, Miss
Bateman, Mr.
Bateman, Mrs.
Bateman, Miss
Batten, Mr.
Bayley, Rev. E.
Beamish, Mrs.
Beamish, Miss
Beardsley, E. E.
Beattie, A.
Beauchamp, Right Hon. Earl
Beeston, Rev. R.
Beeston, Miss
Beckford, Rev. C. D.
Beckford, Mrs. C. D.
Bell, Mrs. W. B.
Bell, Rev. W. C.
Bell, W. W.
Bell, Miss
Benbow, Miss
Bencroft, Mrs.
Bennett, Rev. J.
Bennett, Rev. T.
Bennett, Mrs. T.
Benoliel, Rev. M.
Benson, Rev. R. M.
Bent, Rev. R. P.
Bent, Mrs.
Beresford, Mrs.
Bernard, J.
Bernard, Miss
Berthon, Rev. E. H.
Best, H. G.
Best, Mr.
Best, Mrs.
Best, Hon. & Rev. S.
Bevan, Mr.
Bevan, Mrs.
Bevan, Miss
Beynon, Rev. W. L.
Bickersteth, Mrs.
Bigg-Wither, Rev. H. J.
Bigg-Wither, R.
Biggs, Rev. W.
Billing, Rev. R. C.
Bingley, Rev. J. G.
Bingley, Mrs.
Binney, Rev. J. E.
Bishop, J.
Blackburn, Rev. S.
Blackman, A. J.
Blackmore, Rev. R. W.
Blagden, Rev. H.
Blagden, Rev. J.
Blagg, Rev. M. W.
Blatch, Mrs.
Blatch, Miss
Blencoe, Miss
Blencoe, Miss
Blundell, C. E.

Blunt, Rev. A. C.
Blunt, Lady Susan
Blunt, Rev. C. H.
Blunt, Gen. C. H.
Blunt, Rev. J. St. J.
Blunt, Rev. W.
Body, Rev. G.
Boger, G. O.
Bolton, Rev. T. D.
Bolton, Mrs.
Bolton, Miss
Bond, Dr.
Bond, Miss E.
Bone, W.
Booker, Rev. H. C.
Booker, H. F.
Borland, Rev. R. S.
Bostock, Mr.
Bothamley, Rev. H.
Bourne, Miss Sturges
Bousfield, Rev. H. B.
Bowker, H. F.
Bowman, R. W.
Bowstead, Mrs.
Bowstead, Rev. J.
Box, Miss
Boyce, G.
Boyd, Rev. J. W.
Boyle, Rev. G. D.
Boyle, Mrs. G. D.
Bradby, Mrs.
Bradby, Miss M.
Bradford, Rev. W. K.
Bradley, Rev. A.
Bradley, Mrs. A.
Bradley, Rev. E.
Bradley, Mrs. E.
Bradshaw, Miss
Brady, Sir A.
Brain, Miss
Braithwaite, Rev. A.
Bramston, Rev. J. T.
Bramston, Mrs.
Bramston, Miss
Brass, Rev. H.
Bray, E.
Bray, Rev. W.
Brenan, Rev. J. E.
Brett, R.
Bridge, Rev. S.
Bridge, Mrs. S.
Bridge, Mrs.
Bridges, Rev. A. H.
Bridges, Mrs. A. H.
Bridges, Rev. A.
Bridges, Miss E.
Bridges, Miss H. M.
Bridges, Miss L.
Brinston, W.
Brinton, C.
Brock, Miss E.
Brodie, Rev. W.
Brodie, Mrs.
Brodrick, Rev. A.
Brodrick, Mrs.
Brooke, W.
Brooke, Mr.
Brooke, Miss
Brooke, Miss T.
Broughton, Mrs.
Browell, Capt., R.N.
Browell, Mrs.
Browell, Rev. E.
Browell, H. E.
Browell, Rev. J.
Browell, Mrs. J.
Browell, W. F.
Brown, Rev. F.
Brown, Mrs. S.
Brown, Rev. T. M.
Bruce, T. R.
Brunell, Miss
Buchan, H. J.
Buchan, Mrs.
Buchanan, Rev. T. B.
Buckle, Rev. G.
Buckley, Miss
Buckwell, Rev. W. B.
Bull, F.
Bull, Rev. T. W.
Bull, E. C.
Bull, Mr.
Bull, Mrs.
Bull, Miss
Bullar, Mrs.
Bullar, Miss E.
Bullar, Miss M.
Bullen, Mrs.
Bullock, Rev. F.
Bullock, Mrs.
Bullock, Rev. G. F.
Bullock-Webster, Mrs.
Bullock-Webster, Miss
Bullock-Webster, Miss E.
Burland, Rev. C. J.
Burnaby, Rev. F. G.
Burnaby, Mrs. F. G.
Burnaby, Gen.
Burnett, J. J.
Burnett, Mrs.
Burney, Miss
Burney, Miss B.
Burr, E.
Burrard, Miss
Burrough, Rev. J. W.
Burrows, Mrs.
Burrows, Miss
Burrows, Rev. H. W.
Burton, Rev. A. B.
Bury, Rev. C. A.
Bush, Rev. J.
Buttemer, Rev. A.
Buttemer, Rev. R. D.
Buttemer, Miss
Butler, Rev. J. B. R.
Byrne, Rev. H.

C

Cadogan, Rev. E.
Calcroft, Mrs.
Cambridge, Rev. E. P.
Campbell, W.
Campbell, Mrs.
Campbell, Miss
Campbell, Miss R.
Campbell, Miss A.
Campe, Rev. C.
Canning, Mrs.
Canning, Miss
Capel, Rev. B.
Capper, O.
Capper, Mrs.
Carlisle, Rev. H. H.
Carlyon, Rev. T.
Carnegie, Rev. H.
Carpenter, G.
Carr, Rev. J. H.
Carr, Rev. T.
Carr, Mrs. T.
Carr, Rev. T. W.
Carrington, Miss
Cary, Rev. Dr.
Cary, Mrs. J. W.
Cary, Miss M. J.
Cary, Rev. L. O.
Causton, Rev. C.
Causton, Mrs.
Causton, Rev. C. P.
Causton, Rev. E. A.
Causton, Rev. F. J.
Cawley, Rev. T.
Cazenove, Rev. A.
Chaddock, Miss
Chadwick, Miss J.
Chamberlayne, Col.
Chamberlayne, Miss L.
Chambers, Rev. W. H.
Chambers, T. Esq., M.P.
Champernowne, Rev. R.
Champernowne, R. K.
Chapman, Mr.
Chappell, W. B.
Charlesworth, Rev. J. R.
Chatfield, Rev. R. M.
Chattock, Miss
Cheesman, J.
Chevallier, Rev. C. H.
Chichester, Right Rev. Bishop of
Chichester, Dean of
Child, Rev. E.
Cholmley, Rev. J.
Cholmley, Mrs.
Church, Rev. C. M.
Churton, Ven. Archdeacon
Churton, Mrs.
Churton, Rev. H. B. W.
Churton, Rev. W. R.
Clabon, Mr.
Clabon, Mrs.

Clark, Capt.
Clark, D. E.
Clark, Rev. F. S.
Clark, Rev. T. H.
Clark, Rev. W. R.
Clarke, Rev. Dr.
Clarke, Rev. J. E.
Clarke, Rev. J. H.
Clarke, Rev. W.
Clowes, Rev. A.
Cocks, Mrs.
Codd, Rev. A.
Cohen, Rev. T.
Colborne, Hon. & Rev. G.
Coles, R.
Coles, Mrs.
Coles, Miss
Coles, Miss
Coles, Rev. R. E.
Collett, Rev. W. L.
Collett, Rev. W. R.
Collier, Rev. C.
Collins, Rev. Dr.
Collins, Mrs.
Colman, Rev. J.
Comley, J. G.
Compton, Rev. B.
Compton, Rev. J.
Compton, Mrs.
Coney, Rev. E. C.
Connor, Rev. G.
Cook, H.
Cooke, Rev. A.
Cooke, Rev. G.
Cooke, Mrs.
Cooke, —
Cooksey, J. H.
Cooper, Mrs.
Cooper, Miss
Cooper, Rev. C. H.
Cooper, Mrs.
Cooper, Rev. K. R.
Cooper, Rev. M.
Cooper, Mrs. M.
Cooper, W.
Cooper, Miss
Cooper, Miss G.
Cooper, Miss E.
Coote, Admiral
Coote, Mrs.
Corbin, P.
Corfe, Rev. A. A.
Corfe, Rev. A. T.
Corfe, Mrs.
Corfe, C. C.
Corfe, Mrs. G.
Cosseratt, Rev. G. P. G.
Cowan, Rev. J. G.
Cowie, Rev. B. M.
Cowper-Temple, Right Hon. W. F., M.P.
Cox, Rev. F. H.
Coxhead, Rev. J. J.
Coxhead, Mrs.
Crabbe, Miss M.
Craike, Rev. J.
Cranwick, Rev. M.
Cranwick, Mrs.
Crawford, Rev. W.
Crichton, Rev. W.
Croft, Rev. J. H.
Crofton, Sir W.
Crofton, A. M.
Crofts, Capt.
Crofts, Mrs.
Croyden, Mrs.
Crozier, W. J.
Cruikshank, Rev. G. A.
Cunningham, Rev. F. M.
Cust, Rev. A. P.
Cutts, Rev. A. P.

D

Dalrymple, Miss
Dalrymple, Miss
Dampier, Rev. R.
Daniel, Rev. W. C.
Danson, Mr.
Danson, Miss
Darby, Mr.
Darby, Miss
Darnell, E.
Darwin, W. E.
Daubeny, Rev. J.
Davidson, Rev. A.
Davidson, Rev. F.
Davies, Rev. F.
Davies, Rev. H. D.
Davies, Rev. J. L.
Davies, Rev. J. S.
Davies, Rev. T. L. O.
Davies, Miss
Davies, Miss M.
Davies, Rev. O.
Davies, Rev. U.
Davis, W. H.
Davis, Rev. G.
Dayman, Mr.
Dayman, W.
Dear, Miss
De Chair, Rev. F. B.
Deey, Rev. A. W.
Dible, Mr.
Dible, Mrs.
Dible, Mr.
Dible, Mrs. S.
Dickson, Rev. R. B.
Dixon, Rev. J. H.
Dopledge, Rev. G.
Douglas, Rev. A.
Douglas, Mrs.
Douglas, Miss
Douglas, Miss L.
Douglas, Miss J.
Douglas, Mrs.
Dove, Mr.
Dover, Right Rev. Bishop Suffragan of
Dowling, Rev. B. B.
Downman, Mr.
Dowson, Miss
Dowson, Miss C.
Doyle, Rev. W.
Drake, Mrs.
Drewe, Rev. W. B.
Drewe, Mrs.
Driver, R.
Driver, Mrs. R.
Driver, Rev. S. R.
Druitt, Rev. R. W.
Drury, Mr.
Drury, Mrs.
Drury, Mr.
Drury, S. J.
DuBoulay, Rev. F.
DuBoulay, Rev. F. H.
DuBoulay, Rev. J. T. H.
DuBoulay, Mrs. J. T. H.
Dube, Rev. E.
Dumbleton, Rev. E.
Dumergue, Mr.
Duncan, Mr.
Duncan, Mrs.
Duncan, J. E.
Dunlop, Mr.
Dupont, Rev. J. M.
Durrant, Rev. J.
Durrant, Mrs. J.
Durrant, Rev. R. N.
Durell, Rev. J. D.
Duthie, Rev. C. J.
Dyce, Miss
Dyer, Mrs.
Dyer, Miss
Dyer, Miss C. M.
Dykes, Rev. Dr.

E

Earle, Rev. J.
Eaton, Rev. W. F.
Ede, E. L.
Ede, Miss
Edgington, Rev. C. N.
Edmunds, Mr.
Edwards, J. C.
Edwards, Mrs. J. C.
Eliot, Rev. P. F.
Elliott, J.
Elliott, Mrs.
Elliott, Miss
Elliott, S. C.
Elliott, Mrs.
Elliott, Miss
Elmer, Mr.
Elonis, Rev. J. H.
Elwes, E.
Emery, Ven. Archdeacon
Erle, Sir W.
Esdaile, C.

Esdaile, W. C. D.
Etches, W.
Evans, Dr.
Evans, P. T. C.
Everard, Rev. G.
Everett, Mrs.
Everett, Mr.
Ewbank, Rev. H.
Eyre, G.
Eyre, L.
Eyre, Rev. W.

F

Fairbairn, Mrs.
Fairbairn, Rev. A. H.
Fairbairn, Mrs. A. H.
Falvey, Miss
Fane, E.
Fawkes, Miss
Fearon, Archdeacon
Felton, Rev. F.
Fendall, Miss
Festing, Rev. G.
Ffinch, Rev. M. M.
Ffoulkes, Archdeacon
Fielder, Rev. J.
Fincher, Rev. J. G.
Fincher, Rev. J. M.
Finlay, Rev. E.
Finlay, Mrs.
Fisher, Rev. F.
Fitzgerald, Rev. G. S.
Fitzwygram, Rev. J.
Fleming, Miss L.
Fletcher, F. W.
Fletcher, J. I.
Flower, Mrs.
Forbes, Rev. E.
Fowell, Rev. R. D.
Fowler, Miss
Fowler, Miss M.
Fox, Rev. G. E.
Fox, Miss
France, Rev. T. W.
Fraser, Rev. J. H.
Freeman, Ven. Archdeacon
Freeman, Rev. E. P. W.
Freeman, Miss
Freeman, Miss F.
Fremantle, Rev. Canon
Frere, Sir Bartle
Fuller, Rev. J.

G.

Gabriel, S.
Gabriel, Mrs.
Garbett, Rev. E.
Garnier, J. Carpenter
Garnier, Hon. Mrs. C.
Gardiner, Miss
Garratt, Rev. S.
Garrett, Mr.
Gaze, Rev. J. P.
Gaze, Mrs. J. P.
Gedge, Rev. S.
Geldart, Rev. J. W.
Gibson, E.
Gilbert, H. M.
Gillett, Rev. G. E.
Gillett, Rev. H. H.
Gillett, W. S.
Gillett, Mrs.
Gillett, Miss
Gillington, Rev. J. M.
Gingell, Mrs. W. H.
Girdlestone, Rev. F.
Glanville, Rev. J. G.
Glennie, Rev. A. H.
Gloucester, Archdeacon of
Glynn, W. A.
Gobat, Rev. F. B.
Goddard, Rev. F.
Godwin, Mr.
Goe, Rev. F. F.
Goldie, Rev. C. D.
Gorden, Rev. R.
Gorden, Rev. W. D.
Gordon, Rev. R.
Grafton, Rev. A. W.
Graham, Rev. W. H.
Grainger, Rev. J.
Grant, Archdeacon
Grant, A. H.
Grant, Miss
Grant, Mr.
Grantham, H.
Gray, J.
Gray, Miss
Gray, Rev. H. R.
Gray, Mrs. H. R.
Greathead, Rev. J.
Green, Mr.
Green, Mrs.
Green, Rev. E.
Greene, Rev. C.
Greene, Mrs.
Greenfield, W. B.
Greenfield, Mrs.
Greenfield, Miss
Greenfield, Miss D.
Greenly, Rev. J. P.
Greenstreet, Rev. F.
Greenstreet, Mrs.
Gregory, Rev. Canon
Gregory, Rev. F. F.
Gregory, Rev. F. M.
Greyson, Rev. W.
Griffiths, Mrs.
Grove, Mr.
Gruggen, Rev. G. S.
Gubbins, Rev. R. S.
Gubbins, Mrs. R. S.
Guiana, Right Rev. Bishop of
Gurney, Rev. F.

H.

Haigh, Rev. J.
Haigh, Mrs.
Haigh, Mrs. W.
Hale, Rev. C.
Hall, Rev. E.
Hall, Rev. J. M.
Hamilton, Mr.
Hammond, Mr.
Hammond, Mr.
Hammond, Mrs. H.
Hammond, Miss
Hancock, Mrs.
Handley, Rev. E.
Hankinson, R. C.
Hankinson, Mrs.
Hankinson, Miss
Hannah, Rev. Dr.
Hardin, D. G.
Harding, Rev. J.
Harding, Mr. J.
Harding, Mr.
Harding, Mrs.
Harding, Miss
Hardwicke, Countess of
Hardy, Dr.
Harke, Rev. F. M.
Harkness, Rev. G. L.
Harkness, Rev. R.
Harkness, Mrs. R.
Harland, Rev. A.
Harland, Mrs.
Harper, G. T.
Harper, Mrs.
Harrill, Mr.
Harris, Rev. G. C.
Harris, Mrs.
Harris, Miss
Harrison, C.
Harrison, Miss J.
Harrison, Rev. Dr.
Harrison, Rev. E. D.
Harrison, Rev. R. E.
Harrison, Rev. W.
Harrison, Rev. W. D.
Harvey, Rev. R.
Harvey, Mrs.
Haslan, Miss
Hatherton, Lady
Hay, H. W.
Hay, Mrs.
Hay, Miss
Hay, Miss L.
Hayes, Rev. H.
Haynes, Miss
Hayton, Rev. G.
Hayton, Mrs. G.
Hayton, Rev. T.
Hazelfoot, Mrs.
Hazelton, Mrs.
Hazelwood, Rev. F. F.
Headlam, Miss
Heathcote, Right Hon. Sir W.

Heathcote, Lady
Heathcote, Rev. A. W.
Heathcote, Miss H.
Hedger, P.
Hedger, Mrs.
Hedger, Miss
Heigham, Rev. A. L. C.
Hemmans, J.
Henly, Rev. H.
Hentley, W.
Henwell, Miss
Herbert, Rev. H.
Herbert, Miss
Herford, Rev. E.
Hervey, Rev. T.
Hessey, Rev. Dr. F.
Hewett, Rev. C.
Hewett, Mrs.
Heywood, Sir T. Percival, Bart.
Heywood, Lady
Heywood, Miss
Heywood, A.
Heywood, Rev. H. R.
Higgins, C. L.
Higgins, Mrs.
Hill, Alsager Hay
Hill, Rev. E.
Hill, Rev. Ed.
Hill, Rev. G.
Hill, Mrs. G.
Hill, J.
Hill, J. L.
Hill, Mr.
Hill, Mrs.
Hills, Rev. G. W.
Hills, Rev. J. C.
Hoare, Rev. E. Z.
Hoare, Rev. G.
Hoare, Rev. G. T.
Hoare, J.
Hoare, Rev. R. W.
Hoare, Rev. W. H.
Hobhouse, Right Rev. Bishop
Hobhouse, Miss
Hodges, Rev. Dr.
Hodkinson, D.
Hodgson, Rev. G. F.
Hodgson, Rev. J. D.
Hodgson, Rev. O. A.
Holbecke, Miss
Hole, Rev. W. B.
Holgate, Wyndham
Holland, Rev. E.
Hollond, E. W.
Hollingsworth, Mr.
Holmes, Rev. E. M.
Hooper, Miss
Hope, A. J. B. Beresford, Esq., M.P.
Hope, Lady Mildred
Hope, Miss
Hope, Miss A.
Hopkins, Mrs.
Hordern, Rev. J.
Horman, Rev. D.
Horsfall, A.
Horsley, Colonel
Hoskin, Miss
How, Rev. W. W.
Howard, Rev. W. H.
Howes, Mrs.
Howlett, Rev. F.
Hoyes, Miss
Hoyes, Miss M.
Hubbard, E.
Hubbard, Mrs.
Hubbard, Miss
Hulse, Sir E., Bart.
Hulton, Rev. C. G.
Hulton, Mrs. C. G.
Hulton, Rev. W.
Humbert, Rev. L. M.
Humphrey, Rev. F.
Humphry, Rev. W. G.
Hunt, Mr.
Hunt, Mrs.
Hunt, Miss
Hurdis, Miss
Hurdis, Miss E.
Hurdis, Miss L.
Hutchings, Rev. R. S.
Hutchings, Mrs.
Hutchins, Rev. W.
Hutchins, Mrs.
Hutchinson, Rev. C. P.
Hutchinson, Mrs. C. P.
Hutchinson, Mrs.
Hutchinson, H. P.
Hutton, Rev. V. W.

I.

Iggulden, Rev. W. H.
Iggulden, Mrs.
Irons, Rev. W. L.
Irons, Mrs.

J.

Jackson, Rev. H.
Jackson, Rev. J.
Jacob, Archdeacon
Jacob, Rev. Edgar
Jacob, Rev. Ernest
Jacob, Rev. J. J.
Jacob, Rev. W. B.
Jacob, Mrs.
Jacob, Miss
James, Rev. E.
James, Mrs.
James, Rev. J. K.
James, Mrs. Stanley
Jardine, Dr.
Jelf, Rev. G. E.
Jellicoe, Mrs.
Jellicoe, Miss
Jellicoe, Miss M. L.
Jellicoe, C. A.
Jellicoe, Rev. G. S.
Jellicoe, J.
Jenkins, Rev. R.
Jenkins, Miss
Jenkins, Miss E.
Jenkins, Rev. W.
Jenkinson, Rev. J. S.
Jenner, Right Rev. Bishop
Jepson, E. G.
Johnson, Capt.
Johnson, Mrs.
Johnson, Miss
Jones, A.
Jones, Capt.
Jones, E. S.
Jones, Miss E.
Jones, Rev. H.
Jones, Rev. H. W.
Jones, J. K.
Jones, Rev. L.
Jones, Rev. R. E.
Jones, Rev. T. B.
Jones, Rev. W. T.
Jones, Mrs.
Joyce, Rev. J. W.
Jubb, Rev. H.

K

Keate, Mrs.
Kebbel, Rev. C. D.
Kendall, Miss
Kennaway, Sir John, Bart.
Kennaway, J. H., M.P.
Kennaway, Mrs. J. H.
Kennedy, Rev. W. S.
Kent, Miss
Ker, Mrs.
Kerley, Miss
Kettlewell, Rev. S.
Kilpack, Mr.
Kilroy, Mrs.
King, Rev. A.
King, Miss
King, Miss L.
King, Miss M.
Kingsley, Rev. Canon
Kirkpatrick, Rev. R. C.
Knapp, Rev. J. H.

L.

Lacy, Lieut.-Col.
Lacy, Miss
Lacy, Miss G.
Lacy, Miss L.
Lake, Dr.
Lake, Rev. W. H. C.
Lambert, Rev. R. U.
Lander, Rev. J.
Landers, Rev. N. J.
Lanfear, Rev. N. F.
Lang, A.
Langlow, Miss

Langstaff, Dr.
Langstaff, Mrs.
Lankester, F.
Lankester, H.
Lankester, Mrs. J.
Lankester, Mr.
Lankester, W.
Laurence, Rev. G.
Lavers, N. W.
Lawrence, Dr.
Lawrence, Mrs.
Lawrence, Rev. G. G.
Lawrence, Rev. J. A.
Lawrence, P.
Lawson, Rev. J. A.
Lea, Miss
Lear, Rev. Canon
Lee, Rev. E. H.
Lee, Rev. G. B.
Lee, Rev. J. M.
Lee, Mrs.
Lees, A. H.
Lees, Mrs.
Le Feuvre, J. E.
Le Feuvre, Mrs.
Le Feuvre, Miss M.
Legg, Miss
Legh, Rev. H. E.
Leigh, Miss M.
Le Mesurier, Rev. J.
Le Mesurier, Mrs.
Le Sueur, Rev. A.
Letchworth, Rev. A.
Letchworth, Rev. H. H.
Lewis, Rev. J.
Lewis, Rev. P.
Lewis, Miss
Limn, Dr.
Lindsell, Miss
Little, J.
Little, Rev. W. H.
Littledale, Rev. Dr.
Littlewood, Rev W. E.
Lloyd, C. T.
Lobb, J.
Lobb, Miss
Lobb, Miss H. C.
Lofty, Rev. F. F.
Lomer, Mr.
Lomer, Mrs.
Lomer, Miss
Lomer, W.
Loney, Mrs.
Long, Miss
Long, Rev. R.
Longlands, Rev. W. A.
Longlands, Miss
Longlands, Miss
Longlands, Miss E.
Longlands, Miss
Longman, G.
Longman, W. H.
Longman, Mrs.
Longman, Miss
Longman, Miss M.
Lonsdale, Miss
Lord, Rev. F. B.
Lovell, Miss
Lowder, Rev. C. F.
Lower, Rev. H. W.
Lowrie, Capt.
Lowther, Mrs.
Lucas, Rev. G.
Lucas, Rev. W. H.
Lucas, Mrs.
Luke, Rev. W. H. C.
Lyman, Rev. T. B.
Lyon, Rev. S. E.
Lyon, Rev. W. H.

M

Maberley, J.
Macaulay, Rev. J. H.
Macaulay, Mrs.
MacCalmont, Rev. T.
MacCalmont, Mrs.
MacCalmont, A.
MacCalmont, Miss
Mackarness, Rev. G. R.
Mackarness, Mrs.
Mackey, Mrs.
Mackonochie, Rev. A. H.
Maclachlan, Rev. A. C.
Maclagan, Rev. W. D.
Maclean, Dr.
Maclean, Mrs.
Macnamara, Rev. T. B.
Madan, Rev. J. R.
Maddock, Rev. E.
Maddock, Rev. E. K.
Maddock, Miss
Madras, Right Rev. Bishop of
Maine, Mrs.
Mainjoy, Miss
Mainjoy, Miss E.
Maitland, Rev. E.
Majendie, L. A.
Malcolm, Mrs.
Malden, Rev. C.
Malet, C.
Malet, Rev. W. W.
Mangles, Rev. A.
Mann, Miss A.
Mansfield, R. B.
March, Rev. S.
Markby, Rev. E.
Marriner, Rev. W.
Marriner, Mrs.
Marriott, Rev. F.
Marriott, Rev. J.
Marriott, Mrs.
Marriott, Miss
Marriott, Miss M. A.
Marsden, Rev. T.
Marsh, Rev. T.
Marshall, C.
Martell, Mr.
Martin, Rev. H. A.
Martin, Rev. R. M.
Martin, W.
Martin, Mrs.
Massey, Rev. T. H.
Massingberd, Rev. Chancellor
Masters, Rev. G. S.
Masters, Rev. H. A.
Masters, Rev. J. H.
Matthews, Rev. R. B.
Maturin, Rev. B.
Maturin, H.
Maude, Hon. Capt. F., R.N.
Maudby, Mr.
Maudby, Mrs.
Maul, Rev. G.
Maul, Miss
Maule, W.
Maxwell, Mrs.
May, Rev. F. S.
Mayes, E.
Mayhew, Rev. C. B.
Maynard, Rev. E. H.
Maynard, Rev. R. F.
Mayow, Rev. M. W.
McAnally, Rev. D.
McCreery, Rev. H. W.
McDougall, Right Rev. Bishop
Mead, Rev. R. G.
Mead, Mrs.
Medd, Rev. P. G.
Medley, L.
Medlicott, Rev. W. E.
Medlicott, Mrs.
Melina, Rev.
Melville, Rev. Canon
Menzies, Rev. W.
Mercer, G. H.
Mercer, Mrs.
Merlin, Rev. S.
Messenger, Rev. J. F.
Michell, General
Middleton, Rev. J. D.
Midwinter, Rev. W.
Miles, G. H.
Miles, M.
Miller, Mrs.
Milton, Rev. W.
Mitchell, F. J.
Mitchell, Mrs.
Moberly, W. H.
Molyneux, Rev. W. M.
Monro, Rev. P.
Monsell, Rev. Dr.
Moon, Rev. E. G.
Moor, Rev. J. F.
Moor, Mrs.
Moore, Rev. T.
Moorhouse, Rev. J.
Mooyart, Ven. Archdeacon

Morgan, Rev. J.
Morgan, Rev. L. C.
Morgan, Miss
Morrice, Rev. W. D.
Mooyart, Mrs.
Mortimer, Rev. Dr.
Mortimer, Miss
Mortimer, Rev. T. G.
Munro, Rev. H.

N

Naghten, A. R.
Naghten, Mrs.
Naghten, Miss E.
Napier, Rev. C.
Nash, Rev. J. P.
Nash, Rev. L.
Nelson, Right Hon. Earl
Nelson, Countess
Nelson, Hon. Capt. M. H., R.N.
Nelson, Hon. Mrs.
Nelson, Lady
Nelson, Mr.
Neville, Rev. S.
Neville, Rev. W. F.
Newbolt, Rev. D.
Newdigate, Rev. A.
Newell, Rev. C. F.
Newman, A.
Newman, R.
Newman, Mrs.
Newton, Mrs.
Nicoll, Rev. C.
Nicoll, Mrs.
Norman, Mr.
Norman, Mrs.
Norman, Miss
Norman, Miss E. A.
Norris, Rev. C.
North, J.
Nugée, Rev. G.

O

Ogden, W. H.
Ogle, Mrs.
Ohio, Right Rev. Bishop of
Oke, R. R.
Oke, Mrs.
Oldfield, Col.
Oldfield, Mrs.
Oldham, Rev. J. R.
Olivier, Rev. H. A.
Olivier, Mrs.
Olivier, Miss
Ommanney, Rev. G. D. W.
Owen, Miss
Oxford, Right Rev. Bishop of

P

Page, Mr.
Page, Mrs.
Page, Miss A.
Page, Miss R.
Page, Mr.
Page, H.
Palk, E.
Parker, Rev. A.
Parker, Rev. J. A.
Parker, Rev. R.
Parker, Mrs.
Parker, Rev. S. A.
Parker, Miss
Parkhouse, Miss
Parkin, Rev. C.
Parkin, Miss
Parkin, W.
Parkin, Mrs.
Parr, Miss
Parry, Rev. H. L.
Parry, Mrs.
Passenger, Mr.
Payne, C. S.
Payne, Mrs.
Payne, Rev. E.
Payne, Mrs.
Payne, Rev. R.
Peacock, Rev. W. J.
Pearce, Rev. W. E.
Pearson, J., Q. C.
Pearson, Mrs.
Pechell, Mrs. A.
Pelham, Rev. A. T.
Pennethorne, Rev. G. W.
Pennicott, Mrs.
Perkins, Mr.
Perkins, Mr.
Perkins, F.
Perkins, H.
Perry, Rev. S. G. F.
Perry, Rev. T. W.
Peter, Rev. R. G.
Peterborough, Right Rev. Bishop of
Pettiward, Rev. R. G.
Phelps, Rev. E. S.
Philipps, Mrs.
Phillips, H. C.
Phillips, J. W.
Phillips, Miss
Phillips, Mrs.
Phillips, Mr.
Phillips, Mr.
Phillips, Mrs.
Philps, E. R.
Phinn, Rev. C. P.
Phinn, Mrs.
Phipps, Rev. G. W.
Phipps, Mrs.
Pickard, C. E.
Pickard, Rev. H. A.
Pickard, Miss
Pickard, Miss L. C.
Pickard, Cambridge, Rev. O.
Pinkney, Rev. T. A.
Plow, Miss
Plumptre, Rev. E. H.
Pocock, Mrs.
Pocock, J. N.
Polliarett, Rev. R.
Polliarett, Mrs.
Poole, Rev. A.
Poole, Rev. A.
Portal, Wyndham S.
Portman, Rev. H. F. B.
Portugal, Miss
Postlethwaite, Mrs.
Pound, Rev. W.
Powell, A.
Powell, Rev. G.
Powell, L.
Powell, Miss
Powley, Rev. M.
Powsford, Rev. W.
Powys, Mrs.
Powys, Miss
Powys, Rev. F. A.
Powys, Mrs. J. L.
Powys, Miss E.
Preece, Mrs.
Price, Rev. A. C.
Prince, Mrs.
Pringle, Miss
Procter, Rev. G. A.
Procter, Mrs.
Procter, Miss S.
Purdue, Rev. G.
Purdue, Mrs.

Q

Quin, C.

R

Radcliffe, Rev. J. W.
Raikes, F.
Randall, Rev. J. L.
Randall, Rev. R. W.
Randall, W. B.
Randell, Miss C.
Randell, Miss E. A.
Ransom, Alderman
Ransom, Mrs.
Rawlinson, Rev. Professor
Redenhill, Rev. H. L.
Reed, Mrs.
Reynardson, Colonel
Reynardson, Mrs.
Reynardson, Miss
Rice, Rev. C. H.
Rice, Mrs. C. H.
Richards, Rev. J. W.
Richards, Mrs.
Richardson, Rev. T.
Ridding, Rev. Dr.
Ridge, Mrs.
Ridgway, Mrs.
Riggs, W. S.
Risk, Rev. J. E.
Robbins, Mrs.
Roberts, Miss

Robertson, Rev. D.
Robertson, Mr.
Robins, J.
Robinson, Rev. T. H. G.
Rodd, Rev. C.
Rogers, Rev. T.
Rogers, Rev. S.
Rogers, Rev. W.
Rogers, W. H.
Rosoman, R. R.
Rowed, H.
Rowed, W.
Rowley, Rev. W. W.
Russell, Rev. F.
Russell, Mrs.
Russell, Rev. R.
Russell, Mrs.
Russworm, Rev. A.
Ryan, Right Rev. Bishop
Ryan, Rev. J.
Ryan, Mrs.
Rycroft, Sir Nelson, Bart.
Ryle, Rev. J. C.
Ryle, Mrs.

S

St. Paul's, Very Rev. Dean of
Salisbury, Right Rev. Bishop of
Salusbury, Rev. A. P.
Salter, Mrs.
Salter, Master
Sampson, J. K.
Sampson, Mrs.
Sanders, Rev. F. G.
Sanders, Rev. J.
Sand, H.
Sapte, Rev. H.
Saunders, Rev. F. G.
Saunders, Miss
Savory, Rev. E.
Savory, D.
Scard, Rev. T.
Sclater-Booth, W., Esq., M.P.
Scott, Lady H.
Scott, Rev. L.
Scovener, Miss
Scrase, H.
Scrase, Mrs.
Scrase, Mr.
Scroggs, Rev. S.
Scroggs, Mrs.
Scurray, Mr.
Sealy, Rev. W.
Seaman, Rev. J. B.
Seaman, Rev. S.
Seaman, Mrs.
Sedgwick, Rev. A.
Sedgwick, Mrs.
Sells, Rev. A.
Selway, Miss
Sergeant, Rev. E. W.
Sergeant, Mrs.
Seymour, Rev. G. A.
Seymour, Mrs.
Seymour, Rev. R.
Sharland, Mr.
Sharland, Mrs.
Sharland, W.
Sharp, M. R.
Sharp, W. W.
Sharp, Miss C. C.
Sharp, Miss W. M.
Sharpe, Rev. B. O.
Sharpe, R.
Sharpe, Miss
Sharpe, Miss L.
Shaw, Rev. G. A.
Shaw, R.
Shaw, W.
Shayler, Rev. A.
Shears, Rev. A.
Shears, Mrs.
Sheppard, Rev. H. A. G.
Sheppard, Rev. H. W.
Shipley, Conway
Shipley, Mrs. C.
Shipton, W. E.
Shores, Mrs.
Shum, Miss
Shute, Colonel
Shute, Mrs.
Shuttleworth, Rev. W. L.
Shuttleworth, Mrs.
Silver, A.
Silver, Rev. E.
Simmonds, Rev. Dr.
Simmonds, Rev. J. D. L.
Simonds, W. B., Esq., M.P.
Simonds, Mrs.
Simpson, T.
Simpson, Mrs.
Slade, Rev. J. J.
Slade, Miss
Slater, E.
Slater, Mrs. E.
Slater, Rev. J.
Sledgway, Rev. F.
Sloggett, Rev. C.
Smart, Rev. B.
Smart, Mrs.
Smith, Rev. B.
Smith, E. F. N.
Smith, Miss
Smith, J. C. G.
Smith, Rev. R.
Smith, Spencer
Smith, Miss
Smith, Miss
Snook, Mr.
Sorrell, Rev. J.
Southouse, Rev. G. W.
Sprague, Rev. W. S.
Spranger, F. G.
Spurr, H.
Squire, Rev. C.
Squire, Miss
Stace, Miss
Staley, Right Rev. Bishop
Staley, Mrs.
Staley, Miss
Standen, Rev. W.
Standish, W. C.
Standish, Mrs.
Stanham, Rev. L.
Stapylton, Rev. W. C.
Stebbing, J. R.
Stebbing, Mrs.
Steel, Mr.
Stephenson, F. C.
Stephenson, Rev. J.
Steward, Rev. C. E.
Steward, Mrs.
Stewart, Rev. J. A. Shaw
Stewart, Mrs.
Stewart, J. Shaw
Stickland, Mr.
Still, Rev. J.
Stobat, Rev. H.
Stock, E.
Stock, Mrs.
Stock, Rev. J. F.
Stokes, Rev. H.
Stokes, Miss
Stone, Rev. C. H.
Storrs, Rev. H. J.
Storrs, Mrs.
Strafford, Miss
Strawbridge, J.
Strawbridge, Mrs.
Streatfield, Rev. G. S.
Stretfield, Rev. R.
Stribling, Rev. Mr.
Studwick, Mrs.
Sturgess, Rev. S.
Summer, Rev. G. H.
Sumner, Mrs.
Sumner, Rev. J. M.
Sumner, Miss
Sumner, Miss L.
Sutton, Rev. R.
Sutton, Rev. R. C.
Sutton, Rev. S.
Sutton, Rev. W. Manners
Sutton, Mr.
Swainson, Rev. C.
Swayne, Rev. R.
Sweet, Rev. J. B.
Symes, C.
Symes, Mr.

T.

Talbot, Hon. J. G., M.P.
Talbot, Hon. Mrs. J. G.
Tanner, Rev. J.
Taylor, Rev. H.
Taylor, Mrs.
Taylor, Rev. R. A.
Terry, Rev. S.

Theobald, Rev. C.
Theobald, Mrs.
Thicknesse, Rev. J. H.
Thicknesse, Mrs.
Thomas, Rev. G.
Thomas, Miss
Thomas, Miss J.
Thomas, H.
Thomas, Mr.
Thomas, Mrs.
Thompson, Rev. G.
Thompson, Mrs.
Thompson, Rev. J. H.
Thornton, Rev. S.
Thorold, Rev. A. W.
Thorp, Ven. Archdeacon
Thorp, Miss
Timbrell, Miss
Titcomb, Rev. J. H.
Tizard, Rev. W. C.
Todd, Miss
Tomlin, Mrs.
Tooke, Rev. T. H.
Toomer, Miss
Toomer, Miss E.
Toomer, Miss M.
Torr, Rev. J.
Torr, Mrs.
Tracey, Rev. H.
Travers, Rev. K. D.
Trench, Lady H.
Trevanion, J. C.
Trevelyan, Col.
Trevelyan, Rev. W. P.
Trotman, Rev. E. T.
Truman, Miss M.
Tryon, M. General
Tryon, A.
Tudor, Rev. H.
Tuffnell, C. C.
Tupper, Miss
Turner, Rev. C. B.
Turner, Miss
Turner, Miss
Turner, Miss E.
Turner, F. B.
Twemlow, Rev. W. H.
Twigg, Rev. R.
Twigg, Rev. R.
Tylee, C. J.
Tylee, Mrs.
Tylee, Miss
Tyndale, Rev. H. A.
Tyrwhitt, Lieut., R. N.
Tyssen, Rev. R. D.

U.

Unwin, Mr.
Unwin, Mrs.
Unwin, Miss
Utterton, Ven. Archdeacon
Utterton, Miss
Utterton, Miss H.

V.

Vaughan, Rev. C. L.
Venables, Rev. Canon
Vibert, Rev. J. P.
Vincent, Capt.
Vincent, Mrs.
Vincent, Mr.
Vincent, Miss
Vincent, Miss
Vincent, Miss C.
Vincent, Miss E.
Vyvyan, Mr.

W.

Waddington, Mr. J. T.
Wade, Rev. A. A.
Wade, Mrs.
Wade, Miss
Waite, Mr.
Waite, Miss
Wakeford, Mr.
Wakeford, Miss
Walker, Rev. R. H.
Walker, Miss
Wallace, Rev. J. E.
Walmsley, Mrs.
Walsh, Rev. C.
Walsh, Rev. W.
Walters, Miss
Walters, Miss E. F.
Ward, Rev. F. P.
Ward, Rev. G. H.
Ward, Rev. J.
Warden of St. Augustine's, Rev. the
Ware, Rev. H. R.
Ware, Miss
Ware, Miss H. S.
Warne, Mrs.
Warner, Rev. C.
Warner, F. I.
Warren, Rev. E. B.
Warren, Rev. P. F.
Warren, Mrs.
Warren, P.
Waterhouse, N.
Watson, Rev. A.
Watson, Mrs.
Watson, C. K.
Watson, Rev. G. B.
Watts, Rev. I.
Watts, Rev. R. E.
Weatherley, G.
Webber, Rev. R.
Webber, Rev. W. T.
Weir, Rev. Dr.
Wells, Rev. A.
Wells, Miss
Wells, Miss M.
West, Miss
West, Rev. R. T.
Westbrook, Rev. B.
Westlake, Miss
Westlake, Miss E.
Westlake, Miss E.
Westlake, W. C.
Weston, Mrs. P.
Wharton, Rev. J. C.
Wheat, Rev. C. J.
White, Rev. A. L.
White, Rev. L. B.
White, Miss
White, Miss A.
White, Miss A.
Whitehead, Rev. E.
Whitehead, Mrs.
Whiting, Miss C. M.
Whiting, Mr.
Whyley, Rev. T.
Wickham, Rev. G. V.
Wickham, Rev. L.
Wickham, Miss L.
Wigram, Rev. F. E.
Wigram, Mrs.
Wigram, Miss L. K.
Wilberforce, Rev. B.
Wilford, Miss F.
Wilkins, H. C.
Wilkinson, Rev. Dr.
Wilkinson, Rev. A. J.
Wilkinson, Miss
Wilkinson, Rev. T.
Wilkinson, Mrs. T. H.
Wilks, Miss
Willes, Rev. E.
Willett, Miss A.
Willett, Miss J.
Willett, Rev. E. A.
Williams, Rev. G.
Williams, Rev. G. A.
Williams, Rev. J.
Williams, Miss
Williams, Rev. T.
Willington, Rev. J. R.
Willis, Rev. W. D.
Wills, Rev. C.
Wills, Mrs.
Wilshire, Mr.
Wilson, Rev. Dr.
Wilson, Rev. C. Carus
Wilson, Rev. R. F.
Wilson, Rev. R.
Wilson, Rev. W. C.
Wilson, Mrs.
Wilson, Miss
Wilson, Miss
Wilson, Miss M. A.
Wilson, Rev. W. Wynne
Wilson, W. Wynne
Wilson, Mrs.
Wilson, Rev. Mr.
Wilson, Mrs.
Wilton, J.
Winchester, Right Rev. Bishop of
Winstanley, Mr.

Withers, Mr.
Withers, Mrs.
Withers, Miss
Withers, Miss A.
Witt, Miss
Wood, J. W.
Wood, Mrs.
Woodham, Rev. W.
Woodin, Miss
Woodward, Rev. M.
Woolcott, Mrs.
Woollcombe, Rev. W. W.
Woolward, Mrs. R.
Woolward, Miss
Worsley, Mrs.
Wray, Rev. H.
Wray, W.
Wright, Rev. H.
Wright, Mr. H.
Wright, Rev. W. B.
Wyatt, Rev. J. D.
Wyatt, Rev. J. J. P.

Y.

Yelf, Miss
Yonge, Mrs.
Yorke, Hon. A. G.
Young, Rev. J. G.
Young, Mrs.
Young, Rev. J. P.
Young, Mrs. G.
Younge, Miss

SOUTHAMPTON:
GUTCH & COX, CAXTON STEAM PRESS,
150, HIGH STREET.

3 2400 00670 4625

GTU Library
2400 Ridge Road
Berkeley, CA 94709
For renewals call (510) 649-2500

All items are subject to recall